DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 335 923 FL 019 412

AUTHOR	Riley, Kathryn, Ed.
TITLE	Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, Volume 5, Number 2.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania Univ., Philadelphia. Graduate School of Education.
PUB DATE	89
NOTE	117p.; For individual papers, see FL 019 413-414, ED 317 089, and FL 019 416-418.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Chinese; *Classroom Communication; Conflict Resolution; Discourse Analysis; Foreign Countries; Indigenous Populations; *Interlanguage; Interpersonal Communication; Interviews; *Language Patterns; *Language Research; Literacy; Peer Relationship; Personal Autonomy; Physician Patient Relationship; Radio; Research Utilization; *Second Language Learning; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS	Brazil

ABSTRACT

The working papers contained in this volume include the following: "Research on Language Learning; How Can It Respond to Classroom Concerns?" (Teresa Pica); "Building Rapport Through Indirect Complaints: Implications for Language Learning" (Diana Boxer); "(Bi)literacy and Empowerment: Education for Indigenous Groups in Brazil" (Ana Chacoff); "Peer Groups and the Language of Negotation" (Joanne Drechsel); "'In Chinese Way, .../ko+i:uwn/': An Analysis of the Interlanguage of Yihwen Kuo" (Jeanne Newman); and "Qualifiers in Patient-Physician Discourse: An Analysis of Interviews from Radio Call-In Programs" (Jennifer Pappas). (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Riley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

WORKING PAPERS IN EDUCATIONAL LINGUISTICS

Editor: Kathryn Riley

Editorial Staff:
Joel Hardman, Thomas Hickey, Jeanne Newman

Language in Education Division
Graduate School of Education
University of Pennsylvania

Division Faculty
Teresa Pica, Chair
Morton Botel
Catherine Doughty
Nancy Hornberger
Susan Lytle
Vanessa Siddle
Nessa Wolfson

Programs

Educational Linguistics
TESOL
Intercultural Communication
Reading/Writing/Literacy

Volume 5, Number 2
Fall, 1989

FL019412

STUDY
LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION
AT PENN

EDUCATIONAL LINGUISTICS
TESOL
INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION
READING / WRITING / LITERACY

COURSES INCLUDE:

Sociolinguistics / Teaching the Basic Writer / Second Language Acquisition / Teaching Reading to Second Language Learners / Bilingual Education / Reading, Writing and Computers / Classroom Discourse and Interaction / Social and Historical Perspectives on Literacy / Forming and Reforming the Reading and Language Arts Curriculum / Advanced Methods in TESOL / Structure of the English Language

M.S. Ed., Ed..D., Ph.D.
Full and part-time
Scholarships and Fellowships

For detailed information, clip and mail to: Admissions Office, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, 3700 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA. 19104-6216

Name _____

Address _____

_____

Please send information about _____

November, 1989

From the Editor:

The purpose of Working Papers in Educational Linguistics (WPEL) is to present works in progress by students and professors on topics ranging from speech act analysis and classroom discourse to language planning and second language acquisition. Papers included in WPEL are generally based on research carried out for courses offered in the Language in Education Division of the Graduate School of Education.

With this issue we welcome Dr. Teresa Pica as the new chairperson of the Language in Education Division and are pleased to include her article, *Research on language learning: How can it respond to classroom concerns?*, as the lead article in this volume.

It is our intention that WPEL will continue to be a forum for the exchange of ideas among scholars in the field of educational linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania and at universities with similar programs in educational and applied linguistics around the world. WPEL is sent to nearly one hundred universities world-wide.

We hope that you will find this issue both useful and stimulating.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the following individuals whose help and cooperation made this publication possible: Dean Marvin Lazerson, Lorraine Hightower, Cathy Stemmler, Shawne Woodhouse and Robert J. Fleming, P.C., Landscape Architect.

All correspondence should be addressed to:

Working Papers in Educational Linguistics
Language in Education Division A-28, GSE (C1)
3700 Walnut St.
Philadelphia, PA. 119104

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Author	Page
Research on language learning; How can it respond to classroom concerns?	Teresa Pica	1
Building rapport through indirect complaints: Implications for language learning	Diana Boxer	28
(Bi)literacy and empowerment: Education for indigenous groups in Brazil	Ana Chacoff	43
Peer groups and the language of negotiation	Joanne Drechsel	63
"In Chinese Way, .../ko+i:uwn/": An analysis of the interlanguage of Yihwen Kuo	Jeanne Newman	83
Qualifiers in patient-physician discourse: An analysis of interviews from radio call-in programs	Jennifer Pappas	94

Research on language learning: How can it respond to classroom concerns?[1]

Teresa Pica

This paper summarizes recent research in language learning and its implications for language teachers and others interested in language pedagogy and practice.

Whether we are teaching language learners or carrying out research on language learning, we share a number of concerns regarding the work that we do. Often, however, these common concerns are overlooked because the enormity of our task as language teacher or researcher constrains our commitment to fulfilling both of these roles at the same time. There are exceptions, of course, but even when we *seem* to be balancing our roles as language teachers and researchers, we often find ourselves in the position of being more of one and less of the other.

As language teachers, we might find ourselves analyzing our teaching practice and our students' progress as part of the process of planning classroom activities or reorganizing course content. However, this type of research reflects very practical and personal concerns and our findings are seldom shared publicly. As researchers, we usually teach, but often do so through courses in applied linguistics or literature rather than language. Occasionally researchers, themselves experienced language teachers, have kept diaries to look introspectively at the trials and frustrations of their own classroom language learning and their relationship with their teacher. (See, e.g., Bailey, 1981; Schumann and Schumann, 1977; Schmidt, 1986; and others, summarized in Bailey and Oschner, 1983). Yet studies such as these are few and far between. And what they reveal about one individual teacher in a single classroom is certainly of interest, but may not be generalizable to other formal learning environments.

This infrequent cross-over or interchanging of roles of teacher and researcher is also found with regard to the focus of research. Researchers have generally preferred to study the learner rather than the teacher and have seldom examined both learning and teaching at the same time. As a result, we have volumes of data analysis on learners' linguistic productions and misproductions and on features of the social and linguistic environments available to them, these mostly second language (L_2) learning contexts. We also have collections of papers on how

to teach -- how to design the instructional syllabus, create effective classroom materials, and implement practical and productive teaching procedures. However, often much of this material is based on intuition, experience, and common sense more than it is on formal data.[2]

What we have in effect is a situation in which teachers' concerns are informed by their own belief systems and often kept private. Researchers' concerns are shared primarily within the research community, and applied, not to classroom decisions, but to the interpretation of previous investigations and the design of follow-up studies. This is not to suggest that language researchers have little interest in teaching practice. As a matter of fact, many of them were teachers at one time. It was their questions and concerns about classrooms that drew many teachers away from teaching and into research in the first place. In spite of their teaching backgrounds, however, researchers have felt reluctant to take their findings about language learning and apply them directly to the classroom.

Actually, there are very good reasons for this reluctance. The generalizability of language learning research to the classroom has been greatly limited by its focus and context. Much of this research, especially that which has been used to generate and support theoretical claims about the learning process, has been restricted to *second* language learners and their interlocutors, speaking *outside the classroom* and *outside the roles of student and teacher*. The focus of analysis has been mainly on the learner and features of the learner's interlanguage rather than the teacher or the learner-teacher relationship. Although there is a large and growing body of exceptions (see Chaudron 1988 for numerous examples of research on language classrooms), most of the extant data used to ground current theories of language acquisition are skewed toward adult language learners in second language environments. As a result, this research cannot be safely applied to the instruction of foreign language learners in particular or to teaching decisions in general.

Further, what is known about input to learners has come primarily from interview and conversational data, gathered outside the classroom context. It is only recently that *classroom* input has come under study. Researchers such as Long and Sato (1983), Doughty and Pica (1986), and Pica and Doughty (1985a, b) have found features of the L2 available to learners in the classroom to be quite different in structure, complexity and content compared to L2 input addressed to learners engaged in conversations and interviews with native speakers. So again, there is not much basis for application of overall findings on input to what goes on in

classrooms, especially if the classroom is to be the learner's only source of input, as is the case in the foreign language study.

Finally, classrooms are complicated social communities. Individual learners come to them with their own constellation of native language and culture, proficiency level, learning style, motivation and attitudes toward language learning. Individual teachers have their own distinctive styles, and use many different materials and teaching techniques in the course of a single classroom session, countless others in a given week or semester. In attempting to maintain standards of internal consistency, most researchers have investigated only one feature of language learning at a time, for example, learning style or native language transfer, and worked hard to control for all others. Unfortunately, there is no guarantee that the impact of any one feature of language learning, when studied in isolation, will have the same impact when made available in the classroom. In fact, it is unlikely that this will be the case. This is another reason why so many researchers warn that their results should not be applied directly when making classroom decisions. It's not that they feel apathy toward teachers and instructional concerns. It is just so difficult to do research which leads to results that are valid and reliable with regard to statistical criteria and which, at the same time, have direct application to the classroom.

In spite of all this apparent detachment of the research community from the classroom, I believe there are a number of key concerns which puzzle classroom teachers and to which language acquisition researchers can respond. In other words, I feel that if we view the work and responsibility of researchers as one of *responding* to classroom concerns rather than applying their findings directly to the classroom, then researchers can have and further, can *want* to have a great deal to say to teachers. These teaching concerns, which I have referred to elsewhere as "the ten most wanted list in language teaching," (Pica in press) are listed below.

The following review will present these concerns as teachers' questions, then respond to them in terms of what research has to say to teachers, what research has not yet told them but is in the process of investigating, and what research has yet to do. The research presented has come from studies on the learning of English as a second and foreign language as well as the learning of other languages in second and foreign language contexts. I will then discuss the papers of Jorden, Barson, and Klahn both as they pertain to these questions and in relation to the new questions generated by the classrooms they describe.

What questions are of concern to teachers?

1. In what ways does knowing one language help and hinder the learning of a second?
2. What is "comprehensible input" and is it really all that is necessary for successful second language acquisition?
3. What can be done to encourage participation among students who seldom ask questions or initiate interaction?
4. Which is more helpful to acquisition: teacher-led instruction or group work?
5. Should students drill and practice new structures?
6. How much attention should be given to explicit grammar instruction?
7. Does correction assist language learning?
8. How necessary to learning a language is cultural integration with its users?
9. Why do some students have less accurate pronunciation than others and what can be done about this?
10. How can fossilized learners and "terminal twos" be helped to move beyond their current L2 level?

1. In what ways does knowing one language help and hinder the learning of a second?

Researchers have responded to this question in a variety of ways. Working out of a tradition known as Contrastive Analysis, much of the early work in applied linguistics focused on forms and features of the languages learned in classrooms rather than on classroom learners themselves. It was believed that native language could predict difficulty in second or foreign language learning and that therefore the work of the researcher was to compare the native language of the learner with the language the learner wanted to acquire. Influenced by Charles Fries (1945) and Robert Lado (1957), researchers made inventories of the sounds, words, and structures of students' first and foreign languages and suggested teaching decisions in accordance with similiarities and differences presented in these inventories. Their ideas and their methods of analysis are represented in the following quote from Lado (1957): "We will assume that the student who comes in contact with a foreign language will find some features of it quite easy and others extremely difficult. Those elements that are similar to his native language will be simple for him, and those elements that are different will be difficult" (p. 2) .

It is now widely acknowledged by both teachers and researchers that the prediction principles set forth by Lado could not be relied upon in the classroom. Some cases in point: (1) Even though there are similarities between both English and Spanish negation and articles systems, native speakers of English come to learn Spanish negation patterns quite quickly, while their mastery of the Spanish article system takes much more time. (2) Many learners, e.g. from Japanese L1 background, come to master the English system relatively quickly, despite vast differences between their L1 negation system and that of English. They accomplish this much faster, in fact, than those learners with negation structures similar to English, e.g., Spanish, Russian, and Italian. (3) Most learners find that internalizing the rules for using articles in another language is an arduous and protracted process, no matter how many similarities or differences between the other language and their first language. In short, countless studies of and practical experiences in the learning and teaching of languages have shown that predictions of Contrastive Analysis do not always hold. L1-L2 differences do not necessarily imply learner difficulties and similiarities between L1 and L2 do not guarantee ease of learning.

Subsequent researchers have come to show that the learner's native language plays an important role in language learning, but it is a highly differentiated one, much more intricate than that predicted through Contrastive Analysis. Thus Zobl (1980) has argued that native language plays a different role at specific stages of development. As he examined negation data from second and foreign language contexts, Zobl noted that, cross-linguistically, all learners produced no +verb (I no see [bus]) as a very early stage of L2 negation development. Those for whom negator +verb was a grammatically precise way to express negation in their native language remained at this early stage much longer than those who expressed negation in other ways, e.g., verb + negator. This helped to explain why native speakers of languages such as Spanish, Russian, and Italian, for whom no + verb is the target in their language had more difficulty in mastering English negation than native Japanese speakers who use the very different post-utterance negation (I [bus] see no).

Zobl also noted that the complexities and uniqueness of the article system of individual languages made mastery difficult for all learners, regardless of whether they used an article system in their first language. Again, this was why all learners of English, including Spanish and Japanese speakers, had difficulty with acquiring accuracy in this area.

Other researchers have noted that learners' L1 is not always in itself the most powerful influence on language development, but can be suppressed, enhanced or otherwise modified by the contributions of a broad range of linguistic, psychosocial, and cultural factors. Thus Tarone and others have noted ways in which universal aspects of language and language learning can influence the acquisition process. As early as 1980, she reviewed work suggesting that universal tendencies toward simplification played an important role in the speech production of learners. Looking at English L2 learners from a variety of L1 backgrounds, she found that all of them tended to simplify L2 consonant clusters toward open syllable (CV) patterns producing, e.g., pəlace instead of place , whether or not they could produce such consonant clusters in their native language.

Sato (1984) found that certain L2 linguistic contexts were especially sensitive to L1 influence. One of these was L2 final consonant clusters: If the learner's L1 had only final consonants and/or open syllables, but no clusters, the learner would reduce L2 final clusters to a single consonant. Thus the learner might say, He like me instead of He liked me or He likes me. An utterance such as this could pose problems for both the listener, puzzled by the learner's intention, as well as the teacher, concerned as to whether omission of -ed or -s endings reflected pronunciation or grammatical difficulties or both.

Other researchers have identified links between first language influence and sociolinguistic factors. Dickerson (1975) found less evidence of L1 transfer in learner's speech in formal speaking situations; she suggested that such situations allow more close attention to speech. For example, English learners L2 pronunciation was more English-like when they read a list of words than when they engaged in conversation. Other studies have shown somewhat opposite results, i.e., that learners indeed transferred L1 sounds into their formal L2 speech, but only under the condition that the transferred sounds were associated with formal situations in the learners' L1. Beebe (1980), for example, found unexpectedly that L1 speakers of Thai produced a trilled (non-target like) r in English L2 syllable-initial positions in formal L2 speaking situations, but not in informal situations. To explain this behavior, Beebe suggested that since r trilling is a prestige feature in spoken Thai, these speakers may have been transferring it into English L2 when asked to speak in formal contexts.

Beebe and Zuengler (1983), in looking at a variety of language learners interacting with different interlocutors, found that learners' use of L1 vs. L2 linguistic features fluctuated according to their degree of divergence and

convergence with their interlocutor. No single interlocutor feature could be held solely responsible for such a result, however. Rather, interlanguage varied in relation to ethnicity, gender, L1 background, expertise on a topic, and a host of situational variables.

How do these findings respond to teachers' concerns about the role of students' first language in the learning process? Clearly the influence of the learner's L1 is highly differentiated and not as simplistic as was previously thought. Teachers need to think about not only the features of their students' L1, but also about universal aspects of language and language learning. Individual psychosocial and cultural features must be given considerable thought, especially in classrooms where learners interact with different interlocutors, not just their teachers, but a wide range of other language learners. In designing classroom materials and tasks and in placing expectations on their students' progress, L1 and L2 comparison inventories are simply not enough and may, in fact be misleading.

2. What is "comprehensible input" and is it really all that is necessary for successful second language acquisition?

Until recently, the term, "comprehensible input" was not within the repertoire of second or foreign language teachers. However, with the publication of *The Natural Approach* (1983), this term became synonymous with what was considered the goal of effective language instruction. The Natural Approach has had especially widespread appeal because it reflects both second and foreign language teaching concerns emanating from the backgrounds of its authors, Stephen Krashen and Tracey Terrell.

The driving force behind the Natural Approach is largely that of Krashen's Monitor Theory of language acquisition. Krashen makes a distinction between L2 *input* to learners and their actual linguistic *intake* : He argues that second or foreign language input must be comprehended as intake in order to assist the acquisition process. He also makes claims about i + 1: The best input for acquisition must be (a) meaningful and (b) slightly beyond (+1) the learner's current level of language development (*i*), but made comprehensible through contextual supports. According to Krashen, learners acquire *+1* when they (1) notice a difference between *i* and *i +1*, (2) then hypothesize is that *i + 1* is a target feature, and (3) finally confirm their hypothesis when hearing *i + 1* again in input. (See Krashen 1985 for a full elaboration of this process).

Not all researchers who have studied learners in classrooms agree with Krashen's ideas about the sufficiency of comprehension to successful language acquisition. Nor, given its state of inadequate operationalization, can any researchers comfortably test Krashen's hypothesis about the *i + 1* construct. However, the overall consensus among researchers is that the learner's linguistic environment is a major contributor to the acquisition process. They have asked how input within the learner's environment can be made comprehensible and have organized their research to respond to this question.

Long (1985) has argued that input is made comprehensible through modified and negotiated *interaction* in which learners seek clarification, confirmation, and repetition of L2 utterances they do not understand. Through these interactional modifications, linguistic adjustments such as repetitions and rephrasings are provided to aid the comprehensibility of unclear input. Research by Long and others (e.g., Blau 1980) has shown that if such adjustments are made a priori to text or lecturette input, they aid the learner's comprehension. Additional research by Pica, Young, and Doughty (1987) has strengthened Long's claims regarding negotiated interaction and its effect on input comprehension. They found that learners who heard linguistically unmodified input (directions to a task), with opportunities to negotiate interaction, e.g., by seeking clarification of direction input with the direction giver, understood it better than learners who heard a linguistically simplified version of the direction input, but were offered no opportunity for such clarification requests.

Why was there better comprehension of the unmodified direction input? Results showed that negotiation between the learners and their interlocutors led directly to modifications in input complexity and redundancy. In the study noted above, direction input was thus made comprehensible without the need for a priori modification by the researcher. A further possibility posed, but not tested by the researchers was that negotiated interaction simply increased the amount of time available to the learners for processing the directions. In other words, it was not the linguistic modifications that were crucial to understanding. Rather, the stretch of time the direction giver took in modifying the directions gave learners an opportunity to process the original direction input so that they could understand it.

How do these research findings respond to the classroom teacher's concerns about comprehensible input? They suggest that teaching a second or foreign language should be an interactive process between teachers and students and among the students themselves. Students need to comprehend the new language, but can

best do this when allowed to ask about what it is that they do not understand rather than rely on their teacher or textbook to anticipate areas of comprehension difficulty and simplify a priori. What these results also suggest is that simply giving students enough wait time to ask questions about or to internalize input that they do not initially understand may have very positive results on their comprehension, without the need for much talk on the teacher's part at all.

In spite of these encouraging suggestions, further research is needed on the longer term effects of comprehension on learner proficiency. If we are to provide a basis for the theoretical importance of negotiated interaction to language comprehension and ultimately, to language acquisition, we must be able to demonstrate the effects of interactional contributions to comprehension over time. To do this requires careful monitoring of both all input learners receive and their opportunities to hear input adjusted to their comprehension level. This type of monitoring is virtually impossible to carry out in second language environments, in which most of the comprehension research has been conducted so far. Learners in second language settings are engaged with numerous interlocutors and are exposed to various input sources which are virtually impossible for a researcher to keep track of. Fortunately, the study of foreign language learners in classroom environments provides an excellent focus for further research on comprehension and input comprehensiblity. Thus, additional and more informed responses to teachers' questions regarding the importance and sufficiency of comprehensible input to successful language learning await research from the foreign language classroom.

3. What can be done to encourage participation among students who seldom ask questions or initiate interaction?

The importance placed on interaction in language comprehension and second language acquisition has activated a need for research comparing interactive vs. non-interactive classroom learners. However, here, research results of relevance to teachers are mixed and often contradictory. Seliger (1977) found that learners who initiated and participated in interactions which required using L2 English in and out of the classroom (High Input Generators or HIGS) made more rapid progress and fewer L1 transfer errors than learners who interacted little (Low Input Generators, a.k.a. LIGS). On the other hand, in a case study of one classroom, Allwright (1980) found that the student who made the most progress in second language development was one who initiated and engaged in less interaction than the most interactive

student in the class. This finding suggested that quieter learners might benefit from the input supplied by their more interactive classmates.

A later classroom study by Pica (1989) found support for Allwright's results. In studying two English L2 classrooms, Pica found that as long as the students were at an intermediate level of L2 proficiency, they could comprehend the input of teacher and peers both by interacting directly and by simply observing interaction among them. However, for less proficient learners in the same classrooms, interaction in the form of opportunities to seek clarification of message content was crucial to their comprehension.

In the midst of these competing findings on the need for learners to interact in order to comprehend a second language, it is important to keep in mind that individual learners have their own ways of drawing input for comprehension. As Wenden (1986) reminds us, based on her extensive study of language learner strategies, learners direct their own learning by diagnosing needs, defining goals, identifying facilitating tasks and strategies, setting priorities, judging progress, changing approaches to learning, when necessary. Learners bring their own individual styles to the acquisition process. Language classroom research needs to probe more deeply into the differential ways that learners find success in their language learning. This is why it is too soon for teachers to turn to the results of a handful of studies on the effects of interaction when making classroom decisions in this area.

4. Which is more helpful to acquisition: teacher-led instruction or group work?

Given the increased emphasis on interaction in the classroom and continued teacher reservation about student group work in the second and foreign language classroom, it seems surprising that so little research has been conducted on its relationship to successful language learning. A rationale for arranging students into groups is provided by only a handful of relevant studies. Among these, Varonis and Gass (1985) have shown that when non-native speakers converse with other non-native speakers, as opposed to native speaking interlocutors, they experience a greater degree of involvement in their interaction, are more persistent in their attempts to get their ideas across, and hence work harder to modify their interlanguage toward greater comprehensibility. Varonis and Gass have found that this pattern becomes increasingly apparent when linguistically and culturally divergent speakers engage in L2 interaction.

In another, much earlier study of learner peer interaction, this one conducted inside a foreign language classroom (among Spanish L1 learners of English in Mexico City), Long, Adams, McLean, and Castanos (1976) found that group work enabled students to use language more communicatively and across a broader range of functions than did lock-step, teacher-led classroom interaction. Thus, the few studies which have been conducted so far appear to favor group work. However, since they have examined a limited range of experiences relevant to language learning. Clearly, additional research on this key area of concern to teachers is in order.

One of teachers' greatest reservations about student group work is that learners will incorporate each other's errors into their own production when working in groups. What Bruton and Samuda (1980) found, however, was that learners' incorporation of other learners' errors into their own production was very rare. What was far more prevalent were learners' adjustments toward more correct production made on their own as well as in response to their classmates' feedback. Similar results were found by Gass and Varonis (in press); the English L2 learners in their study would correct each other's interlanguage errors, and the corrected learners would incorporate the corrections. Such incorporation did not necessarily occur immediately in a follow-up response, but rather several turns later. Again, this suggests a need to study latency effects of peer correction over a long period of time. As suggested in the discussion of research on comprehension under Question 2, above, foreign language classrooms can provide a most appropriate context for this type of long-range research.

Still, not all research on group work is completely supportive of this classroom practice. Doughty and Pica (1986) and Pica and Doughty (1985 a, b) found that it was the learning tasks or activities in which groups engaged, rather than the group pattern, itself, which was critical in effecting the kinds of interaction considered suitable for their learning. Most effective were tasks which required a two way exchange of information, thereby requiring all members to participate. Tasks which focused on problem solving or discussion tended to favor participation among more assertive students, often to the point of monologue. Such behavior left other group members with few opportunities to attempt L2 production or to signal difficulty with L2 comprehension.

Chesterfield et al. (1983) addressed the influence of teachers and peers on language acquisition. Looking at bilingual preschool programs, they found that in classrooms where the majority of students were English speaking, greater

proficiency in English L2 was related to peer interaction more than to teacher interaction. In classrooms where the majority of students were Spanish speaking, greater proficiency in English L2 was related more to teacher interaction than to peer interaction. This finding seems particularly appropriate to foreign language classrooms where learners tend to be homogeneous in the native language, or at least share a common language other than the one they are studying. Working in groups can lead them to turn to their common language and avoid using the second, unless their teacher carefully monitors their language choice.

These various findings point to a significant role for group work in the language classroom. What little research has been done however, suggests that group work by no means guarantees success in language learning, but needs to be tempered in light of social and linguistic conditions in the classroom and the tasks given to learners in their groups. The influence of these social, linguistic, and pedagogical variables, many of which are as yet unstudied, may be why teachers continue to reservations about employing group work in their classrooms. Further research is needed in order to help teachers make more informed decisions about the benefits of this practice to their students' learning.

5. How much attention should be given to explicit grammar instruction?

Again, given recent emphasis on classroom interaction and group work, much recent literature on language teaching methods and well as textbooks for learners has tended to upgrade the importance of activities for meaningful use of the new language and downgrade the contributions made by exercises which emphasize practice of grammar rules. In addition, through what might be considered this "strong" version of communicative language teaching, learners are believed to be able to infer the grammar rules of a new language by means of large quantities of meaningful and comprehensible input and abundant opportunities for L2 social interaction.

Unfortunately, many learners, especially those for whom the classroom is their only context for language learning, meaningful and comprehensible input and opportunities for social interaction may not be possible. Even if such input is provided, the overall amount of input and interaction targeted to individual learners will be reduced in relation to the total number of learners in the classroom. This situation suggests that learners may need a more efficient means to access the

grammar rules of the language they are trying to learn than through listening or reading experiences alone.

Once teachers make a decision toward incorporating explicit grammar instruction in the classroom or strengthen their resolve to teach grammar to their students (a "weak") version of CLT), the question remains as to selection and sequencing of grammar rules so that they can be acquired effectively. Fortunately, a handful of studies focused on this topic reveals a few guiding principles for selection and sequencing decisions based on factors of learnability, linguistic complexity, and learner-readiness.

For Pienemann (1984), for example, there are psychological constraints on language learning that affect the teachability (and hence learnability) of languages. He has shown has shown that word order sequences in German are acquired in order of increasing complexity, but only when the learner is ready, i.e., at an appropriate developmental stage. In studying learners' acquisition of German, he found, for example, that there are four stages of word order through which learners proceed sequentially, without skipping a stage:

1. Subject-Verb-Object -- He must study the book tomorrow
2. Preposing of constituents -- Tomorrow he must study the book
3. Particle movement from utterance internal to final position -- Tomorrow he must the book study
4. Inversion of elements, both utterance internal -- Tomorrow must he the book study?

The role of instruction, as Pienemann found through a longitudinal study, was to accelerate the learner's movement across the stages. Thus, the learner at stage 3 quickly moved to stage 4 if taught its rules. However instruction at the level of stage 4 did not accelerate the L2 development of the learner at stage 2. The stage 3 learner who was not taught stage 4 rules directly also moved to stage 4, based on L2 exposure, but much more slowly than the stage 3 learner given instruction.

The work of Doughty (1988) and Gaws (1982) has shown a positive effect for grammar instruction when the grammatical item was related to other items along the hierarchy of difficulty such as that shown below for relative clauses (see below)

Most Difficult

object of preposition:	The students with whom I studied passed the test
indirect object:	The students to whom you gave the book are my friends
object relative:	The students whom you saw are my friends
subject relative:	The students who did their homework passed the test

Least Difficult

What both researchers found was that the range of relative clause constructions in English could be learned faster if instruction began with the most difficult type of relative clause (object of preposition) rather than the easiest (subject). Thus, teaching the learners the more difficult relative clause structure for object of preposition helped them to acquire easier structures such as indirect and direct object and subject relatives. On the other hand, teaching them subject relatives helped them learn these structures but had no impact on other more difficult structures in the hierarchy.

Another positive aspect of explicit grammar instruction was found for items which are "easy to learn," i.e., have a straightforward form-function relationship, but are difficult to hear in input. Pica (1985), in comparing learners of English as a foreign language with learners of English as a second language who had never had formal instruction, found that instruction appeared to influence production of some structures, but had little effect on others: For plural -s, instructed learners were more accurate than uninstructed learners, who showed greater use of quantifiers with base forms, e.g., three book. For progressive -ing, instructed learners overgeneralized -ing, as in I liking the movie, every day I going home for lunch, I want to seeing you. Uninstructed learners omitted -ing or produced target-like structures. For article a, both instructed and non-instructed learners tended to follow the sequence: a little, a lot, a few > read a book, saw a movie, > with a friend, on a chair.

Given their findings, how might researchers respond to teachers' questions about whether or not explicit grammar instruction is necessary for their students? The effectiveness of grammar instruction appears to depend largely on selection and sequencing of grammar rules and careful assessment of learner readiness. Some items are better off not taught, while the learning of others is enhanced, indeed accelerated, through instruction. Research on grammar instruction has thus begun to explain why learners often "do not learn what teachers teach" (to quote Allwright 1988) and yet master other forms and features quite effectively. So far, a little bit has been uncovered about German and English grammar rules, and some basic principles have been advanced regarding rule selection and sequencing for grammar instruction. There remains an enormous amount of research to be done, however, within individual languages and across different grammatical rules and structures.

6. Should students drill and practice new structures?

Under the influence of the communicative approach to language teaching, drill and practice in the classroom have waned in recent years. A number of studies in second language acquisition appear to support this practice. A recent diary study by Schmidt, who studied Portuguese as a second language in Brazil (Schmidt and Frota (1986), found that many structures, drilled extensively in class, were not carried over into daily conversation. Other structures, although drilled minimally, were used frequently and correctly outside the classroom. It appeared that structures which did not carry over from classroom drill were absent in everyday input or were present in input, but went *unnoticed* by the learner.

Research focused on the role of imitation in language learning (by Eisenstein, Bailey and Madden 1983), revealed positive results for this drill-related activity. During self-production tasks, learners appeared to operate within the current developmental state of their own grammar, and had opportunities to avoid structures and lexis not yet within their control. During an imitation task, on the other hand, learners had to reconstruct their interlocutor's grammar and meaning, and thus produce new structures not quite within their current capacity. The imitation aspect of drill, therefore, seemed to assist learners to attempt structures not quite within their current repertoire and, in effect, help to move them along the acquisition process rather than confine them within the limits of their current repertoire.

Lest we get too enthusiastic about the contributions of drill and practice to language learning, we need to remind ourselves about the importance that has been associated with comprehensible input as the key to successful language learning. Now that teachers have a fairly good idea of ways in which input is made comprehensible, i.e., by a focus on meaning, through linguistic modifications, and within a climate of interaction, they also need to know whether comprehensible input is all that is necessary for successful second or foreign language acquisition and if not, how drill, practice, and other opportunities for learner production can enhance the learning process.

Responding to this question can be accomplished by following the line of research established by Merrill Swain (1985). Swain looked at Canadian Immersion learners who (presumably) had extensive comprehensible input because their L2 exposure was embedded in meaningful subject-matter content. She found that such learners acquired much higher receptive than expressive language skills. Opportunities to hear comprehensible input appeared necessary, but not sufficient

for their successful language acquisition. In generalizing from this result, Swain argued that learners can often understand the meaning of contextualized input without understanding its structure, but to express themselves comprehensibly, they must provide a grammatical structure for their utterances. For Swain, opportunities to hear comprehensible input are simply not enough to insure their successful language acquisition, but learners need opportunities to modify their interlanguage production, i.e., produce comprehensible output as well.

Although Swain's claim is theoretically plausible, Pica (1987) found that the goal of comprehensible output for learners was somewhat impractical. She found that beginning learners had limited opportunities to modify their output because when they had difficulty making their interlanguage comprehensible, their interlocutors tended to model correct versions of their interlanguage productions for them. The learners then needed only to acknowledge the model versions of their interlocutor rather than attempt their own modifications toward target-like use. Pica found, for example, that if the learner said I many fren, their native speaker interlocutor would reply: you have many friends? . All the learner needed to say in response was yes; this eliminated any need for learners to adjust their interlanguage syntax and vocabulary in order to make themselves understood. Since the native speaking interlocutors in Pica's study were teachers, it was believed that this result was due to features of teacher speech. This possibility suggested both a warning to teachers about their use of modelling and further, a need for follow-up research on ways in which conditions could be made more conducive to learners' output modification.

In such a follow-up study (Pica, Holliday, Lewis, and Morgenthaler 1989), in which teachers were excluded from the native speaker interlocutor selection process, it was found that learners' modification of their L2 output was much more prevalent, but that this was related to the nature of the task on which they worked with the interlocutor, the nature of the request made by the interlocutor, and the learner-interlocutor gender pairing. Thus, learners made more interlanguage adjustments on information-gap tasks in which they were required to draw a picture then describe it so that it could be replicated by their interlocutor. In addition, interlocutors' open-ended clarification requests such as what did you say? were more conducive to learners' modifications than confirmation checks such as you said book?, this latter more often than not responded to with yes. Finally, it was found that male learners made more adjustments in their L2 production than females, especially during open-ended discussion. However, since all NS interlocutors studied

were female, this left open the possibility that results were due more to gender pairing than to learner gender in itself.

These results have a great deal to say to language teachers, given typical language classroom conditions: use of activities in which it is the teacher rather than the learner who holds all the information needed for the activity, teachers' practice of modelling correct versions of student responses rather than giving them time to reformulate and try again, and the current professional climate whereby female instructors predominate in language classrooms. And, as Swain argues, learners must have opportunities to produce comprehensible output *during interaction involving meaningful content* . Such opportunities allow them to modify interlanguage toward greater clarity, to make hypotheses about the L2, and to try to map L2 form onto meaning. Drill and practice of isolated grammatical structures does not seem sufficient in scope for helping learners reach this goal. What research has shown is that indeed no single practice -- from structure drill to open-ended conversation operates in isolation to help or inhibit language learning. The more researchers examine learner production both in and out of classrooms, the more it becomes evident that all classroom practices are mediated by a host of learner, interlocutor, and situational variables.

7. Does correction assist language learning?

One of the most widely held assumptions about the language learning process is that errors indicate learner hypotheses about the target language and that overt correction cannot alter learners' natural path of acquisition (For reviews of this position see Richards 1978, Ellis 1984). Numerous inventories of learner errors have been compiled into the now widely familiar categories of (1) overgeneralization: She has two childrens He teached English Did he teached English, (2) overuse She has one books She liking school, (3) omissions: She is doctor She has three book He teach English, and (4) analogies: We walk with the girls. We follow with the girls. It is believed that in producing these errors, learners are testing hypotheses about rules and patterns in the language they are learning.

Recent theories of Bley-Vroman (1986), Schachter (1984) and White (1987) have argued against the belief that learners' incorrect hypotheses should go uncorrected. They claim that explicit and/or implicit correction (also referred to as "negative input" by Schachter 1984) is essential to a theory that includes hypothesis testing as part of the second language acquisition process. This is because lack of correction may imply to a learner that a non-target-like utterance was inaccurate.

Unless otherwise corrected, learners who have two ways of forming structures in their L1 may be misled to believe that these same two options exist in the L2, even though the L2 allows for one option only. Thus the learner whose first language allowed the same expression for greetings and partings might believe that Hello could be used similarly for both functions in English. However, such a flawed hypothesis would inevitably lead to a communication breakdown between the learner and an interlocutor in the course of everyday social interaction, and therefore it would be corrected quite readily.

More serious, however, would be the learner's mistaken hypotheses about L2 structural features. These can become internalized as rules within the learner's interlanguage grammar since they lead to productions which, although grammatically imprecise, are communicatively functional. For example, if the L1 allowed dative formation with either Prepositional Phrase (PP) (gave a book to the girl) or Indirect Object (IO) (gave the girl the book), but L2 allowed PP only, the learner might assume that: (a) L2 allowed both PP and IO but (b) IO was seldom used. This false hypothesis would lead to ungrammatical IO productions which although awkward-sounding, could be, nonetheless, sufficiently comprehensible to interlocutors to pass uncorrected during in social discourse.

How do these theoretical claims and examples help teachers make informed decisions about correction in the classroom? This is a difficult question to answer since research on the actual practice of classroom correction has shown it to be a highly diversified entity. Correction can be focused sometimes on meaning and other times on structure. It can be provided differentially and unsystematically to and across students, yielding confusing and, at times, contradictory results. Fanselow (1977) found that in Spanish foreign language classrooms, teachers corrected students more frequently for errors in meaning than for errors in grammar. Student answers which teachers treated as errors tended to be those which did not correspond to what the teacher expected to hear from the student. Outside the classroom, Brock, Crookes, Day, and Long (1986) found that correction had no significant effect on destabilizing learners' interlanguage during half hour research sessions. However, when learners were corrected by their interlocutors during communication games, they quickly adjusted their interlanguage accordingly.

Schmidt and Frota (1986) found that although explicit correction had a differential and inconsistent effect on his target-like use of Portuguese L2. In order to benefit from corrections, Schmidt claims that he had to know he was being

corrected. Hearing a corrected version immediately following what he had just said helped him "notice the gap" between his interlanguage and the target Portuguese. Informal (off-record) correction in the form of interlocutor confirmation checks and clarification requests had no discernible effect on internalization of L2 rules and features.

What has been advanced about the role of correction in the learning process appears not only confusing in itself but also to contradict Krashen's claim that comprehensible input is all that is needed for successful second language acquisition. Much of the confusion and contradiction is based on the fact that so little is known about the nature of correction -- or comprehension for that matter -- and its effect on the learning process. As has been noted all along in this paper, a carefully controlled approach to such research is difficult to carry out in the L2 settings which have dominated language learning research. Although there is a great deal of difficulty in any research which attempts to trace the impact of correction on the learning process, foreign language classrooms provide at the moment the best research site for finding answers to this crucial area of language learning.

8. How necessary to learning a language is cultural integration with its users?

This is a question which troubles foreign language teachers, as they work with students in classrooms far removed from the culture of the language they are learning. However, in some respects, second language environments pose problems for cultural integration as well. Just because a learner lives in a country where the language under study is spoken widely in the community does not guarantee opportunities for integration with its users. And even when there are opportunities for integration, language learning is not always guaranteed.

In support of the need for cultural integration in language learning, Schumann (1978) reports on the psychosocial profile of Alberto, whose English L2 development remained virtually unchanged over 10 months of Schumann's research and who revealed *little* adaptation to his U.S. urban community or integration with its speakers. Schmidt (1983) on the other hand, presents the psychosocial profile of Wes, whose English L2 development remained virtually unchanged over several years of Schmidt's research, despite *extensive* adaptation to his U.S. urban community and integration with its speakers. Meisel, Clahsen, and Pienemann (1981) have attempted to sort out these apparent contradictions in the role of

cultural integration in the learning process. Their research showed that acquisition of German L2 word order (as discussed above, under Question 5) followed an invariant path, based on complexity of linguistic features and cognitive processing, whereas acquisition of inflections and functors varied across learners, in correlation with factors of acculturation.

In a recent study, DeKeyser (1986) compared learners of Spanish as a foreign language whose contact with the language came from the classroom with those who also participated in a semester abroad program, with opportunities for cultural as well as linguistic contact. What he found was that greater fluency in Spanish was displayed by the latter group. In an ongoing research project, Freed is examining the long term effects of cultural contact after students return from a study abroad program. Both of these studies will reveal the extent to which exposure to speakers in the actual culture of the language studied affects proficiency and the learning process itself. Attempting to separate the contributions of cultural integration from other factors is difficult to do in a second language context, where learners are exposed to a variety of cultural experiences at the same time they are engaged in formal classroom study. Research on study abroad programs, in which there is a temporal sequencing between and classroom contexts, may perhaps provide the most revealing answers to questions regarding the need for cultural integration in successful language learning.

9. Why do some students have less accurate pronunciation than others and what can be done about this?

Purcell and Suter (1980) present one of the most exhaustive and definite responses to this question:

> The variables which turn out to be important seem to be those which teachers have the least influence on. *Native language*, the most important predictor, from historical accident. Similarly, *aptitude for oral mimicry* seems beyond the control of the instructor; it is doubtful that one can make a good mimic a naturally poor one. ... *Length of residence in a country where the target language is spoken natively* is largely beyond the instructor's control. Finally, while *strength of concern for pronunciation accuracy* might be fortified by an effective teacher, this concern is often the result of personal motivations

> and attitudes established well before the student enters the classroom. (84)

Dickerson (1975) further reminds us of the extensive range of precision possible for learners in their L2 speech sound production. In her study of Japanese L1 learners of English, she found that they did not immediately pronounce English L2 sounds correctly in all linguistic contexts. Instead, they acquired variants and applied them differentially to syllable-initial and syllable-final contexts and in relation to following vowels Gradually, they replaced non-target-like with target-like variants across a increasing number of contexts, e.g., accuracy in pronouncing zoo came earlier than that for please.

What these studies tell the language teacher is that achieving native-like pronunciation is a complex process, largely related to factors beyond the learner's and teacher's control. Yet accurate pronunciation is often viewed as a primary goal in the classroom. A high premium is often placed on accurate pronunciation both as a gross measure of students' progress and an indicator of proficiency in a language. Current research does not appear to validate such a view. For the time being, precise pronunciation may be an unrealistic goal for teachers to set for their students and in their teaching.

10. How can fossilized learners or "terminal twos" be helped to move beyond their current proficiency level?

Many claims have been made as to why many learners, especially adults, do not come to master the rules and features of another language. Higgs and Clifford have used the term "terminal twos" to describe such learners, although the learning phenomenon, itself, is generally referred to as "fossilization." Second language researchers such as Schumann (1978) have argued that limitation of opportunities for integration with a target culture outside the classroom is what brings about such a phenomenon. Higgs and Clifford (1982) have argued that undue emphasis on communicative activities toward building learner fluency results in learners who stabilize at a functional but grammatically inaccurate level of proficiency on the Foreign Service Index. Hence the reference to "terminal twos".

Some researchers have advanced learner-internal explanations for fossilization. Schmidt and Frota (1986), for example, report that fossilized learners who are communicatively functional in L2 do not appear "notice the gap" between their interlanguage and the standard L2 target. Thus, interlocutor confirmation checks and clarification requests may lead the fossilized learner to revise content,

but such moves have no effect on their knowledge of grammatical features. Basing her explanation of the theories of Vygotsky, Washburn (1987) suggests that fossilized learners may lack a 'zone of proximal development' for L2. In other words, unlike learners still capable of developing a second language, fossilized learners may be unable to modify their interlanguage toward accuracy even when supplied with models for them to imitate and to guide their production.

All of these explanations, whether drawn from the learning environment or learners, themselves, point to the need for informed development of instructional materials and procedures for fossilized learners and for ongoing research on the impact of such instruction. If, as claimed by Schmidt and Frota (1986), fossilized learners do not benefit from interlocutor confirmation checks and clarification requests in revising non-target-like grammatical features, there is a need for more grammar based classroom materials. Certainly Higgs and Clifford would agree with such an orientation. So would Yorio (1985), who reports that instruction should proceed from the fossilized learner's strength areas in spoken communication to reading and writing tasks and from contextualized materials and communicative techniques to decontextualized, grammar-oriented instruction. In one study of instructional effects on a fossilized learner, already under way, Sotillo (1987) has found that job-related instruction, as opposed to more general language practice, has had a temporary effect on destabilizing her student's interlanguage toward more target-like use.

Responding to the needs of fossilized learners and of the teachers who work with them seems therefore to depend on finding appropriate materials and procedures and monitoring their impact through careful study. This need opens up a wealth of opportunities for collaborative research between language teachers and researchers.

Overview and prospectus

The research cited represents only a handful of the many recent findings which have contributed helpful responses to teachers' questions about their classrooms of language learners. More answers are sure to come with the aid of future research. Many additional questions confront both teachers and researchers right now; inevitably just as one of these questions is answered, another will be ready to challenge.

Teachers and researchers in urban settings, for example, find themselves increasingly challenged by the linguistic and cultural diversity among children,

adolescents, and adults in schools both in the U.S. and abroad. Many trusted methods for language teaching do not seem to work as well as they once did. Set against pressures to find immediate solutions to students' problems in language and literacy learning is the realization that the research that could help solve those problems takes time and takes teachers away from their work with the very students they want to help.

Challenges also abound as a result of the spread and changing status of languages in an interdependent world. English, for example, has grown from a native, second, or foreign language to become of an international language of business, science, and technology, spoken among more non-natives than natives in the process of their professional pursuits or everyday lives. Surely, this will affect the kinds of learners we will look at in our research and the questions we will ask about them and their language learning. Further, the need for individuals to learn uncommonly taught languages not widely available through classroom courses poses additional challenges for the informed selection of materials and procedures.

Often times, our work as teachers and researchers can seem overwhelming, but by and large it speaks to the tremendous scope and vitality of the field of educational linguistics and its capacity for growth, expansion and longevity. As language teachers and language acquisition researchers, whether veterans or newcomers, we will no doubt continue to rise to the challenges of our professional roles and welcome new challenges that confront us in our work with language learners.

---

[1]A version of this paper was presented at the Symposium on Foreign Language Acquisition, University of Pennsylvania, 1989, sponsored by the consortium on Language Teaching and Learning. Earlier versions have been presented at conferences in the U.S. and Japan.

[2]But see chapters by Pienemann and Lightbown in the edited collection of Hyltenstam and Pienemann, 1984, for some noteworthy exceptions.

References

Allwright, Richard (1980). Turns, topics, and tasks: patterns of participation in language learning and teaching. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.). Discourse Analysis in Second Language Research. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Allwright, Richard (1988). Interaction Analysis . Essex, England: Longman.

Bailey, Kathleen (1981). An introspective analysis of an individual's language learning experience. In S. Krashen and R. Scarcella (Eds.). Issues in Second Language Acquisition: Papers of the Los Angeles Second Language Research Forum. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Bailey, Kathleen.and Robert Oschner (1983). A methodological review of the diary studies: windmill tilting or social science? In K. Bailey, M. Long, and S. Peck (Eds.). Issues in Second Language Acquisition: Second Language Acquisition Studies . Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 188-98.

Beebe, Leslie (1980). Sociolinguistic variation and style shifting in second language acquisition. Language Learning 30, 2: 433-47.

Beebe, Leslie and Jane Zuengler (1983). Accommodation theory: an explanation for style shifting in second language dialects. In N. Wolfson and E. Judd (Eds.). Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition.. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House. 195-213.

Blau, Elaine (1980). The effect of syntax on readability for ESL students in Puerto Rico. TESOL Quarterly 16, 517-28.

Bley-Vroman, Robert (1986). Hypothesis testing in second language acquisition theory. Language Learning 36, 3: 353-76.

Brock, Cynthia, G. Crookes, R. Day, and M. Long (1986). The differential effects of corrective feedback in native speaker-nonnative speaker conversation. In R. Day (Ed.). Talking to Learn. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Bruton, Anthony and Virginia Samuda (1980). Learner and teacher roles in the treatment of error in group work. RELC Journal 11: 49-63.

Chaudron, Craig (1988). Second Language Classrooms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chesterfield, Ray et al. (1983). The influence of teachers and peers on second language acquisition in bilingual preschool programs. TESOL Quarterly 17, 3: 401-19.

Dickerson, Lonna. (1975). The learner's interlanguage as a set of variable rules. TESOL Quarterly 9: 401-408.

Doughty, Catherine and Teresa Pica (1986). "Information gap tasks:"an aid to second language acquisition? TESOL Quarterly 20: 305-25.

Eisenstein, Miriam, Nathalie Bailey and Carolyn Madden (1983). It takes two: contrasting tasks and structures. TESOL Quarterly 16, 3: 381-93.

Ellis, Rod (1984). Understanding Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford anselow, John (1977). The treatment of error in oral work. Foreign Language Annals 10: 583-93.

Fries, Charles (1945). Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Gass, Susan (1982) From theory to practice. In M. Hines and W. Rutherford (Eds.). On TESOL 81. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Gass, Susan and Evangeline Varonis (In press). Incorporated repairs in non-native discourse. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.) Series in Applied Linguistics. Plenum Publishers.

Higgs, Theodore and Ray Clifford (1982). The push toward communication. In T. Higgs (Ed.). Curriculum, Competence and the Foreign Language Teacher. Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co.

Krashen. Stephen (1985). The Input Hypothesis. Essex, England: Longman.

Lado, Robert (1957). Linguistics across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers . Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Lightbown, Patsy (1985). Can acquisition be altered by instruction? In K. Hyltenstam and M. Pienemann (Eds.). Modelling and Assessing Second Language Acquisition. London: Multilingual Matters.

Long, Michael (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. Gass and C. Madden (Eds.) Input in Second Language Acquisition. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Long, Michael (1976). Doing things with words -- verbal interaction in lockstep and small group classroom situations. In J. Fanselow and R. Crymes (Eds.). On TESOL 76. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Meisel, Jurgen, Harald Clahsen, and Manfred Pienemann (1981). On determining developmental stages in natural second language acquisition. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 3, 2: 109-35.

Pica, Teresa (1986). Classroom interaction, participation, and comprehension: redefining relationships. Paper presented at annual TESOL Convention, Miami.

Pica, Teresa (1987). Interlanguage adjustments as an outcome of NS-NNS negotiated interaction. Language Learning 37, 4.

Pica, Teresa, Richard Young and Catherine Doughty (1987). The impact of interaction on comprehension. TESOL Quarterly 21, 4: 737-58.

Pienemann, Manfred (1984). Psychological constraints on the teachability of languages. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 6: 186-214.

Pienemann, Manfred (1985). Learnability and syllabus construction. In K. Hyltenstam and M. Pienemann (Eds.). Modelling and Assessing Second Language Acquisition. London: Multilingual Matters

Purcell, Edward and Richard Suter (1980). Predictors of pronunciation accuracy: a reexamination. Language Learning 30, 2: 271 - 87.

Richards, Jack C. (1978). Understanding Second and Foreign Language Learning and Teaching. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Sato, Charlene (1984). Phonological processes in second language acquisition: another look at interlanguage syllable structure. Language Learning 34, 4: 43-57:

Schachter, Jacqueline (1984). A universal input condition. In W. Rutherford (Ed.). Universals and Second Language Acquisition . Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schmidt, Richard and Sylvia Frota (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: a case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.). Talking to Learn. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Schumann, John (1978). Social and psychological factors in second language acquisition. In J. Richards (Ed.). Understanding Second and Foreign Language Learning and Teaching. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Schumann, John and Francine Schumann (1977). Diary of a language learner: an introspective study of second language learning. In H.D. Brown, R.H. Crymes, and C.A. Yorio (Eds.). On TESOL '77: Teaching and Learning English as a Second Language: Trends in Research and Practice. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Seliger, Herbert (1977). Does practice make perfect?: A study of interaction patterns and L2 competence. Language Learning 27, 2: 263-78.

Sotillo, Susana (1987). The impact of domain-specific instruction on language use: the case of a long term resident second language learner. Paper presented at Annual AAAL Conference, San Francisco, December 28, 1987.

Swain, Merrill (1985). Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass and C. Madden (Eds). Input in Second Language Acquisition. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Tarone, Elaine (1980). Some influences on the syllable structure of interlanguage phonology. International Review of Applied Linguistics. XVIII, 2: 139-52.

Varonis, Evangeline and Susan Gass (1985). Non-native/non-native conversations: a model for negotiation of meaning. Applied Linguistics 6: 71-90.

Washburn, Gay (1987). Fossilization in Second Language Acquisition. A Vygotskyan Perspective. Manuscript, University of Pennsylvania.

Wenden, Anita (1986). Review Essay: The process of intervention. Language Learning 33, 1: 103-21.

White, Lydia (1987). Implications of learnability theories for second language learning and teaching. Paper presented to AILA Congress, Sydney, August, 1987.

Yorio, Carlos (1985). (Many) questions and (very few) answers about fossilization in adult L2 learners. Plenary address. Applied Linguistics Winter Conference, New York, January 19,1985.

Zobl, Helmut (1980). The formal and developmental selectivity of L1 influence on L2 acquisition. Language Learning 30, 1: 43-57.

Building rapport through indirect complaints: Implications for language learning[1]

Diana Boxer

This paper reports the results of a pilot study on indirect complaints; collected data contained six response types and these are described. The paper further suggests the usefulness of indirect complaint sequences as a strategy toward the goal of negotiating interaction for second language acquisition

Learners of English need to be made aware that there exist ways of interacting verbally with native speakers that will enhance their ability to get to know and develop relationships with English speaking peers. Such knowledge can be important not only for lessening their own sense of alienation in a foreign country, but also to give them an opportunity to communicate more in their second language, thus increasing their comprehension of input through negotiated interaction.

Recent research in second language acquisition (Gass and Varonis, 1984; Hatch, 1978; Long, 1980, 1983, 1985; Pica, 1987; Pica et al., 1988; Pica, Doughty and Young, 1986; Pica, Young and Doughty, 1986; Varonis and Gass, 1982) has posited that negotiated interaction is an important condition for successful second language acquisition. The term "negotiated interaction" is used here in a cyclical fashion. First, from the perspective of sociolinguists interested in SLA, it is viewed as a means toward the construction of social relationships. Second, from the perspective of SLA researchers, negotiated interaction has to do with exchanges between native (NS) and non-native speakers (NNS) in which they work toward mutual comprehension through their joint efforts at modifying their input and output (Pica, Holliday, Lewis and Morgenthaler, 1989).

Thus it is posited that there is a link between negotiated interaction and opportunities for learners to signal their need for and receive input adjusted to their current level of L_2 comprehension. This in turn provides NNSs with: 1) opportunities to receive feedback on the comprehensibility and appropriateness of their interlanguage output and 2) opportunities to modify the phonological, morphosyntactic, lexical and pragmatic features of their interlanguage in response

to NS requests for greater comprehensibility. It remains an empirical question as to whether the comprehended input, feedback on comprehensibility or modified production have a long-term destabilizing effect on the learner's interlanguage. The important point here, however, is the distinction between sequential and negotiated interaction; sequential interaction pertains to the smooth, sustained progression of discourse in which a successful social exchange between learners and NS interlocutors is realized while negotiated interaction pertains to the restructuring of discourse until mutual understanding is reached (Pica 1989, personal communication). Successful sequencing can provide learners with NS interlocutor solidarity which can open up opportunities for negotiation, comprehension of unfamiliar L_2 input, and interlanguage modification. It is hypothesized that sequential and negotiated interaction will alternate with one another in an iterative fashion as the relationship develops. What should logically ensue is increased opportunity for learners to build on these friendships with native speaking peers to expand their linguistic abilities in the second language.

The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate the usefulness of indirect complaint (IC) sequences as a strategy toward the goal of negotiating interaction for second language acquisition. The term "indirect complaint" is used here in contrast to formal, or direct complaint (DC), in which disapproval is directed to an addressee held responsible for the perceived offense. IC will be defined as "the expression of dissatisfaction to an interlocutor about someone or something that is not present." The two types of complaints are indeed distinct speech acts eliciting different responses. Whereas DC is typically a confrontative act, IC can be the opposite when it is employed by the speaker in an attempt to establish solidarity with the addressee.

The analysis of IC sequences to be carried out here is based on the assumption that speech behavior is highly patterned at all levels. Thus it is only by looking for larger categories of speech behavior as opposed to studying each speech act in a category in and of itself, that we can attempt to determine the motivations that underlie what people say to one another. By doing this we are brought to the realization that some of these speech acts are motivated by similar underlying strategies; these strategies are realized through a series of moves in a negotiation between participants in an interaction. One major strategy that can be isolated as the common underlying dimension of this subset of speech acts is the attempt to create and/or reaffirm solidarity. Since it is the speech act itself (e.g. complaining) that constitutes the first move in this effort at relationship building, and since the speaker's success depends on the addressee's willingness to participate through the

give and take of negotiation, we can classify such speech acts as "openers": speech behavior which functions in a manner indicating a desire to establish some commonality with the addressee. This commonality need not be anything as major as shared race, religion or ethnicity. It may simply be a subtle indicator of shared feeling or mutual interest. When we think about how ICs function to initiate a topic of conversation, we see that they can and often do fall into the category of openers.

The manner in which the addressee responds to an IC can significantly affect the outcome of an exchange. That is, depending on the type of response elicited, a complaint sequence can affirm or reaffirm solidarity among the interlocutors or alienate them from each other. The implication for learners is that if one wishes to accomplish the former, that is establish some commonality with the speaker, the addressee will need to know how to respond to ICs when they are used as conversational openers.

The corpus of this study consists of seventy sequences of spontaneous conversation in which ICs were uttered. The group studied was the University of Pennsylvania community: students, professors, faculty and student family members, and administrative and support staff. Data collected through participant observation of this group provides examples from a range of speakers varying in age, occupational level and gender, as well in numerous other attributes. A spectrum of role-relationships among subjects is also represented. In the corpus six possible response types were found: a) zero response or change of subject; b) response requesting elaboration; c) response in the form of joking or teasing; d) contradiction or explanation; e) response in the form of advice or lecture; f) commiseration.

The following table summarizes the distribution of responses among the six response types noted above.

response type	percentage of responses
a. zero response, change of subject	4%
b. response requesting elaboration	11
c. response in form of joking, teasing	6
d. contradiction or explanation	12
e. advice or lecture	15
f. commiseration	52

a) Zero response or change of subject

In the corpus of ICs, only 4% of the possible responses fell into the first category, that of zero response or change of subject. Such responses were uttered in situations where the addressee was tired of listening to a speaker complain, where the addressee knew the speaker to be a constant complainer, where there was decreased desire for solidarity, or where there was a high degree of social distance and the complainer was of higher status. In this last case, the assumption is that the addressee would be less likely to respond to a complaint from a speaker of higher status, as advice or contradiction would be inappropriate and commiseration might somehow place the addressee on equal footing. By offering no response in such a situation, an interlocutor of lower status might be merely signaling acceptance of the complaint. Thus this category contained sequences of ICs in which interlocutors varied in their relationships vis a vis the factors of social distance and social status. An example of a situation in which the addressee changes the subject will illustrate just how such a response can foil an opener. The sequence is on the topic of vacations:

1) 1...the last couple of times we went, with the kids, away, you know, it takes a day and a half to get anywhere cause you spend six hours on an airplane.
2 So you stayed at...Hotel. We liked that place.

Since I was the addressee in this sequence, I am able to offer insights into why my response was in the form of a change of subject. Having listened to this female acquaintance, whom I know to be a chronic complainer, I was frankly tired of her complaining and eager to get on to more positive subjects. Though I have known the speaker for several years, she is someone from whom I wish to distance myself precisely because of her constant complaining. Only during the analysis of the data did I realize why I, a person who typically commiserates, did not do so with this interlocutor.

An additional type of complaint that elicited zero response was what is termed the "rhetorical complaint." Such a complaint is typically uttered for the purpose of letting off steam and is often addressed "to the four walls." As such, a response would not be expected. With rhetorical complaint it often happens that another person is present, usually a close friend or intimate. The rhetorical complaint appears to approximate a "response cry", in Goffman's terms (1978), but does not fit into any of his categories precisely. It differs in important ways from his pain cry (e.g. ouch!)

and spill cry (e.g. oops!) in that it is typically more elaborated. To illustrate the difference, an example of a rhetorical complaint from the data follows, in which a husband says in his wife's presence:

(2) I tell you, I'm so tired of being sick!

What is significant about this category of responses is that in none of the examples from the data were the interlocutors attempting to establish rapport. Thus we see that zero response or change of subject occurs at both ends of the social distance continuum. In the rare case (example 1) in which the participants are potential friends, such a response plays an important strategic role in deliberately discouraging solidarity.

b) Response requesting elaboration

When the addressee wanted to get more information about the reason for the complaint he/she requested elaboration. Such requests are sometimes delaying tactics that eventually lead to a response such as advice, contradiction or commiseration. Nevertheless, they sometimes serve as a more subtle way of displaying interest in the speaker by drawing out the complaint in a more elaborated version, thus giving the speaker more opportunity to vent his or her feelings.

An example from the corpus will illustrate this category. Here we have a male/male dyad between a lecturer (L) and his teaching assistant (TA):

(3) TA One thing about the computer class--these people don't know Lotus
L They don't?
TA Not well enough, I don't think. It's like I have to back track to get back to some basics

Only after asking several questions drawing out the complaint did the lecturer begin to give advice. In all the examples from this category the addressee seemed to want to get more information about the reason for the complaint in order to better understand the situation. In the case above it was the role of the lecturer to get to the heart of the matter, as he was responsible for the teaching going on in the class under discussion.

Another case of question response, in a conversation between a male professor and his colleague having lunch at a campus restaurant, the addressee seemed to ask the question as a strategy to keep the conversation flowing. From recent research on

language and gender (e.g. Fishman, 1978; Maltz and Borker, 1982) the expectation would be that women use questions more than men do as a response, since they have been found to use questioning as a strategy for maintaining the flow of a conversation. The few instances of this type of response that turned up in the pilot data, however, were mostly in male/male dyads, but the total number was too small to see any pattern emerge. It will be necessary to investigate whether a larger corpus displays any gender differences in this type of response.

c) Response in the form of joke/teasing

Gender differences appeared significant in other categories of responses, one of which was response in the form of joking or teasing. The literature on language and gender has shown joking to be a more typically male response than female response across varied speech situations (e.g. Coser 1960; Edelsky 1981). In the corpus only 6% of the responses fell into this category, but the majority of these turned up in conversations between male friends. Interestingly, this response type surfaced over the topic of a mugging and rape that took place in the neighborhood of one of the interlocutors in a male/male conversation over lunch in which the participants are status equal friends:

(4) 1 You've gotta be careful where you walk at night because there's a lot of muggings. They had two rapes.
2 Did they blame you? (laughs)

As this is a topic that might make any addressee feel uncomfortable, one way of making light of it would be to turn it around into a joke. But it is appropriate to joke or tease only if the subject is not of serious consequence to the speaker. Had the muggings or rape personally affected the speaker, a more serious response would have been expected.

Status and role relationships between interlocutors appeared to be important in this category of responses. Only one of the sequences in which joking or teasing was the response occurred among interlocutors of unequal status, a female student/female professor, but social distance between them had decreased significantly since the beginning of the semester. Among sociolinguists it is now widely believed that social closeness can override status inequality. More examples of jokes or teasing between interlocutors of unequal status but with decreased social distance may begin to substantiate this belief.

D'Amico-Reisner (1985) found that in her corpus 56% of the indirect disapprovals were about other persons, 27% about things and 18% about self. It may be significant that in my own data four out of five sequences in the joke/teasing category contained either complaints about the speaker himself/herself or a response that jokingly turned the complaint around in a mock-blame of the the speaker. Given this, it will be important to take a closer look at the use of humor in such a situation. The use of jokes or teasing in response to an indirect complaint may be an important strategy for the negotiation of roles and relationships. It may very well be one way for the addressee to tell the speaker that he or she is approved of and accepted. Indeed, it may be the primary way in which male interlocutors get close to each other.

d) Contradiction

One way for the addressee to tell the speaker that the complaint is <u>not</u> approved of and accepted is to contradict the speaker or take the part of the object of the complaint through some kind of defense on its (his/her) part. Approximately 12% of the pilot responses were of this form. In analyzing these data, it was interesting to note that these sequences either involved intimates, status unequals with social distance, the desire for social distance, or non-native speakers who may not have been aware of socially inappropriate responses. It appears that one is more likely to use strategies such as contradiction either when one wishes to distance oneself socially from one's interlocutor or when contradiction is well within the power and role relationships of the participants. Two of the sequences in this category involving power inequality inherent in role relationships were in professor/student interactions. In one, the teaching assistant mentioned in an above example complained about the non-responsiveness of a group of foreign students recently arrived for executive education training. The lecturer's response was to come to the defense of the foreign students. In the other sequence, involving the same lecturer with a doctoral advisee, the lecturer came to the defense of their shared discipline. In both of these examples, roles were strictly defined, despite the fact that the participants were very close in age or perhaps because of the minimal age gap. This very young faculty member, who was no doubt the same age or younger than many of his students, may have needed to crystallize the status differentiation in order to feel comfortable in his role as a lecturer.

Two sequences in this category were complaint responses from male non-native speakers of English. One was a response to a female classmate who had

complained about a male lecturer, a graduate student inexperienced at teaching the subject matter. The male non-native addressee defended the lecturer by saying, "he's not a professor. How would we do if we if we had to teach?" What is so interesting about this particular response is that the corpus was filled with commiserative responses by female native speakers on this same subject (as will be discussed in the category of commiseration). The question, then, is do these non-native speakers miss the opportunity to establish rapport with their complaining interlocutors by not understanding the functions of the speech behavior of IC?

e) Advice or lecture

A fifth category of complaint responses was that of advice or lecture. Fifteen percent (15%) of the pilot data fell into this category, with two-thirds being male responses. Of the total for male responses, one-third took place among status unequals with social distance (e.g. teacher/student). This would be expected, given these two variables: it is the role of a lecturer to advise or lecture. Likewise one-third of the female responses in this category was between female professor and female student. It is interesting to note that although the male lecturer's comments to his students were put in terms of straightforward moralizing, the female professor's advice was put in terms of making the student feel better. For example, one of the male lecturer's responses was as follows: "that's what you get for waiting until the last minute." Contrast this with a female professor's response to a student complaint about transcribing tapes: "well, so you do other things and when it goes on you start writing. You can answer letters or do anything." Embedded in her response is embedded reassurance. An interesting example from the data comes from a conversation that took place in a male professor's home during a conversation between friends about their pre-adolescent daughters; *1* is a female friend, *2* the professor's wife and *3* the male professor:

(5) 1 The thing is, I'd like her friends to feel comfortable coming by. But I'd also like there not to be a lot of unsupervised time. But given the fact that....
2 They're so difficult, these questions!
3 I would say if there were no boys, I wouldn't object to it.

The setting was familiar, the topic of extreme importance to the interlocutors. Yet the wife commiserated with the friend while the husband gave advice in the form of what he would do. The salient variable here seems to be gender. A careful analysis

of the data showed that conversations among status-equal females rarely exhibited responses in the form of advice or lecturing. The six responses that were between status equal male friends ran the gamut of topics and all took place over lunch in campus restaurants. In the following, the speaker complains about unwelcome visitors to his new New York apartment:

(6) 1 That apartment has caused me more grief than you can possibly...
2 Why?
1 Cause as soon as everyone found out I was in N.Y., it's like, you know, everybody...
2 That's the way it goes!
1 Bull!
2 You take the burden on!
1 No, there's no way. I haven't even gotten...no, there's no way!

What we have here appears to be an attempt to outpower each other. Maltz and Borker (1982) note that men's speech across North American subcultures is characterized by storytelling, arguing and verbal posturing. Such verbal posturing often consists of "practical jokes, challenges, put-downs and insults" (p. 212). From these preliminary data it appears that challenges, advice and lecturing or moralizing are common in male complaint responses. By far the vast majority of female responses to complaints in the pilot study were in the form of commiseration.

f) Commiseration

Of the total corpus of complaint responses, 54% were in the category of commiseration, with almost two-thirds of these coming from women. Included in this section are all responses that showed either agreement or reassurance, responses in the form of exclamations having an embedded commiseration, contradiction phrased in a manner attempting to make the speaker feel better, and any other response having embedded agreement, such as a one-syllable utterance in which some prosodic feature indicated commiseration. In sum, included was any type of response that had the illocutionary force of trying to make the speaker feel better. The inclusion of some of these subcategories no doubt added to the male total of commiserative responses. Without the contradictions, for example, the male portion of commiserations would have been considerably lower than one-third.

The most common type of commiserative response was in the form of straightforward agreement with the speaker, elaboration of the speaker's complaint, or some kind of confirmation of the validity of the complaint. Most of the responses

in this category were by female addressees. The following example is taken from a conversation between two female graduate students about to do a homework assignment together:

(7) 1 I'm getting more and more lost
2 So am I
1 And yesterday he went over the homework, which is ...fine, but it didn't prepare us at all for this week.
2 Now. He's just not a good teacher.

Whereas the first response is straightforward agreement, the second contains agreement plus an elaboration in the statement that the object of the complaint is "just not a good teacher." Such responses were frequent in the female portion of this corpus. One or two of the female responses went so far as to finish the speaker's sentence. By filling in the missing word, the implication is that the addressee knows exactly how the speaker is feeling and completely commiserates.

Prosodic features also entered into some of the responses in this category and often served more than one function. A mere one-syllable response, with high/low intonation, can be a signal of agreement and thus commiseration. The next example is taken from a conversation between female graduate students talking in the student lounge:

(8) 1 We went to a party. It was so funny. It was full of Germans. Now I'm used to interacting with Germans and Dutch people, but I was in a different context. So I meet these people. "Hi, I'm (name). And they look at you and say, "yes?"
2 Um (high/low intonation, as if "wouldn't you know!")

One of the advantages of having tape recorded the complaint sequences was the ability to capture such prosodic features. They would necessarily have been absent from field notes, causing more difficulty in interpretation.

Various types of exclamations served as commiserations both by female and male addressees, although more frequently by women. The following exchange took place in a departmental library. The speakers are a female graduate student and the library assistant, also a female graduate student. They know each other by face but not by name:

(9) 1 They never have what you need in here! You'd think they'd at least have the ...
2 They didn't have what you were looking for?
1 No.
2 That's typical!

Through her exclamation, the assistant is signaling that she identifies with the student and commiserates, even though at the moment she is in the employ of the department. The fact that the two are of equal status, that both are students, makes it easier for commiseration to take place. Had the assistant been the librarian, the complaint would have been one of direct rather than indirect disapproval, and the addressee would have been put in the position to either defend or apologize. As it was, it was not the responsibility of the assistant to make sure the library contained all the needed material. Thus status equality played a major role in the type of complaint response uttered. Here it overrode social distance. Indeed, the data showed social closeness to be a less important variable in the category of commiseration than was equality of status. Both friends and acquaintances commiserated, the latter in an attempt to get to know each other better.

Male addressees often used the strategy of advice or moralizing even when they commiserated:

(10) 1 I feel that he's letting me down, you know. This is my time of need. When it was his time of need I came through
2 With children it's all
1 I know
2 It takes ten children to take care of one parent. And they forget it was one parent who raised all of them

In the same conversation, the addressee above became the complainer when he told of the poor quality of his secretary's work. The addressee responded, "You can't get people to do good work." Such responses, it appears, fall into the category of commiseration despite the moralizing. The intent, based on the prosodic features present, was to tell the speaker, "I know that's the way it is, and I feel sorry for you."

In addition to moralizing, addressees, in this corpus mostly men, used the strategy of contradicting a speaker in order to make him/her feel better. We saw earlier how this strategy does not signal empathy, but in three cases in the pilot data it appeared to have the force of commiseration: the addressee was attempting to get the speaker to feel better about a given situation. One sequence was on the topic of

money spent and two about time spent. The following male/male sequence is on the topic of leisure time:

(11) 1 Are you planning any vacations?
2 No. It's hard to get away...other than the mountain house.
1 That's a great vacation!

Only seven of the thirty-seven sequences involving a commiseration response were between interlocutors of unequal status. In six out of seven the commiseration was from the individual of higher status to that of lower status. Although commiserative in nature, these responses took on some form that indicated a power difference.

The expectation when beginning the pilot study was to get responses that were formulaic to the extent that they would approximate something like, "oh, you poor thing." No such response emerged, nor very few that even closely resembled this. Instead, even the commiserative responses ran the gamut of possibilities in structure and intent.

The pilot study confirmed D'Amico-Reisner's (1985) finding that equality of status was a common characteristic of IC. But while she looked at the complaint itself, the focus here was on the response. What both studies have in common is the finding that the complaint and the response have the potential of creating solidarity between participants through the realization of shared feelings. By commiserating with the speaker, the addressee is telling him/her that there exists among them such shared feelings. Carole Edelsky (1988, personal communication) suggests that indirect complaints to friends or strangers serve as requests for acknowledgment of one's perspective. As such, they cut down "existential alienation." After all, it is only the "horrible, serious things" that elicit sympathy. The "everyday, miserable things" ought to elicit commiseration. This study has begun to substantiate this intuition.

Thus the majority of the commiseration responses fell into what Wolfson (1988) has termed "The Bulge." That is to say, most of them occurred among status equals with neither minimal nor maximal social distance. This was true for friends particularly, but also sometimes occurred among acquaintances in an attempt to get to know each other better. Neither interlocutors of extreme social distance, such as teacher/student, nor intimates, such as husband/wife, commiserated to the degree that status-equal friends did. It is within "The Bulge" that we are able to see how openers function. Clearly, with intimates there is no need to employ speech that entails much negotiation between speaker and addressee. With strangers as well,

such as in service encounters, the negotiated give and take inherent in such speech behavior is outside the expectations of the role relationships.

One can, however, easily imagine instances of IC to strangers in certain settings, such as people standing in line for long periods of time. A momentary solidarity can be established between strangers through the use of ICs: "rapport-inspiring topics are commonly raised as a way of doing the face-threatening act of initiating an encounter with a stranger" (Brown and Levinson, 1978: 117). We see from the data that interlocutors have a quite varied choice of possibility of response to ICs. In the case of standing in line complaining to the stranger in front of you about how slow the line is moving, for example, the expected response might be one of agreement, for it is obvious that the interlocutors share a common plight. Perhaps it is the case that increased social distance creates an increased demand for a response and even more of a demand for a commiseration. If so, The Bulge will become skewed. The larger corpus should show more clearly if indeed a commiseration response is more common among interlocutors who are strangers than those who know one another.

By becoming aware of how to use conversational openers such as ICs as a strategy, interpret them for what they are, and respond in an appropriate manner, learners can make use of such knowledge to go beyond the acquaintance stage with their native-speaking interlocutors. The negotiation of meaning resulting from such increased interaction should have a two-pronged and circular effect: enhanced social life and enhanced linguistic ability.

---

[1]The pilot study on which this paper is based was carried out for a seminar in Language in Power taught by Dr. Nessa Wolfson

References

Brown, P. and S. Levinson (1978). Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena. In E. Goody (Ed.) Questions and Politeness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coser, R. (1960). Laughter among colleagues. Psychiatry, 23: 81-95.

D'Amico, Reisner, L. (1985). An ethnographic study of disapproval exchanges. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.

Edelsky, C. (1981). Who's got the floor? Language in Society , 10(3): 383-421.

Fishman, P. (1983). Interaction: the work women do. In B. Thorne, C. Kramarae and N. Henley (Eds.). Language, Gender and Society,. Cambridge: Newbury.

Gass, S. and Varonis, E. (1984). The effect of familiarity on the comprehensibility of non-native speech. Language Learning, 34: 65-89.

Goffman, E. (1971). Relations in Public. New York: Harper Colophon.

Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In E. Hatch (Ed.). Second language acquisition: A book of readings. Rowley, MA.: Newbury.

Long, M. (1980). Input, Interaction and Second Language Acquisition. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, UCLA.

Long, M. (1983). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 5: 177-193.

Long, M. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. Gass and C. Madden (Eds.). Input in Second Language Acquisition. Rowley, MA.: Newbury.

Maltz, D. and R. Borker (1982). A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In J. Gumperz (Ed.). Language and Social Identity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pica, T. (1987). Interlanguage adjustments as an outcome of NS-NSS negotiated interaction. Language Learning, 38 (1): 45-73.

Pica, T., C. Doughty and R. Young (1986). Making input comprehensible: Do interactional modifications help? ITL Review of Applied Linguistics, 72: 1-25.

Pica, T., R. Young and C. Doughty (1986). The impact of interaction on comprehension. Paper presented at annual TESOL Convention, Anaheim, CA.

Pica, T., L. Holliday, N. Lewis and L. Morganthaler (1989).. Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, April 1989.

Varonis, E. and S. Gass (1982). The comprehensibility of non-native speech. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 4: 41-52.

Wolfson, N. (1988). The Bulge: a theory of speech behavior and social distance. In J. Fine (Ed.). Second Language Discourse: a Textbook of Current Research. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

(Bi)literacy and empowerment: education for indigenous groups in Brazil[1]

Ana Chacoff

This paper examines the history of language policy in Brazil, the question of a national language, and their effect on indigenous language education projects, specifically bilingual education. Independent "Freirean" educational projects are analyzed according to the standard models of bilingual education: transitional, maintenance, and enrichment. A case is made that the goals of these projects might ultimately be more assimilationist than pluralistic.

Les blancs debarquent. Le canon! Il fault se soumettre au bapteme, s'habiller, travailler [The Whites get off the boat. The canon! (The Indians) must be baptized, dressed, and put to work.]. --Rimbaud (1983:63)

The field of sociolinguistics has led teachers and researchers of language to raise questions which go beyond purely structural linguistics and see language as a sociocultural phenomenon. There has been a change of gears towards consideration of non-standard varieties and towards the ethnic minority groups who use them. The recent international concern about linguistic/cultural genocide resulting from cultural contact between two unequal societies has generated an increase in language attitude studies.

The development of public-sponsored bilingual schooling is a direct response to linguistic diversity. While I was reading the literature on bilingual education in the United States, questions came to mind regarding language diversity and language planning in my home, Brazil: Wasn't Brazil a monolingual country? Didn't the whole country speak Brazilian Portuguese? Was there bilingual education in Brazil? Wasn't it the case that the Indians who were integrated spoke Portuguese and those who were isolated spoke their own languages and did not need Portuguese? Did Brazilian public schools offer bilingual education? I came to realize that I did not know much about the subject and decided to discover the answer to these questions.[2]

Language Policy

Today there are about 170 indigenous languages spoken in Brazil and the indigenous population who speaks those languages is about 200,000. Only 13% of

these language groups have more than 1,000 speakers and 25% have fewer than 100 speakers. This troublesome matter is worthy of consideration because according to linguists a language needs to have at least 5,000 speakers in order to survive. In Brazil only 8 indigenous languages (Guarani, Guajajara, Xavante, Makuxi, Terena, Tukano, Yanomani, and Tikuna) fall into this category (Rodrigues, 1988).

The language policy carried out by the Brazilian government since independence (1822) has not been well-defined or explicit regarding these non-Portuguese-speaking communities. Instead, the government seems to have followed the colonial policy carried out by the Marquess of Pombal (minister of Portugal in the 18th century) with Portuguese as the language of the urban centers and of political power. According to Rodrigues (1981), during that time Pombal implemented a very strict language policy by imposing the spread of Portuguese as a way of guaranteeing the territorial conquest. Pombal believed the Jesuits were hindering the process of land demarcation in which the maintenance of Tupi-Guarani, the language of the major indigenous group then, was also a hindrance. Therefore, speaking the indigenous language was prohibited and the Jesuits were expelled from Brazil in 1756. Because the Jesuits had learned Tupi-Guarani in order to communicate with the natives and convert them, Tupi-Guarani had been competing with Portuguese. With the expulsion of Jesuits by Pombal, Portuguese overtook Tupi-Guarani and a nationalist trend was in motion.

Throughout the several changes the Constitution of Brazil has undergone, only Portuguese has been considered the national and official language. Both the imperial and the republican governments have maintained an attitude of indifference towards the linguistic minority groups. During strong nationalist times, there have been strict measures which were very similar to those used by the Marquess of Pombal in the 18th century. For example, during World War II, the federal government prohibited the use of Italian, Japanese and German by closing their schools, stopping the publication of their magazines and newspapers and even prohibiting the immigrants themselves from speaking their native languages (Rodrigues, 1981).

Bilingual Education

The government only recently started to develop a formal policy in a direction that would give justice to linguistic minorities. The starting point was the Presidential Act of 1966 (Law 58.824) which ensured bilingual education for Indians and the right to maintain their own languages. In 1973 FUNAI (the Brazilian

National Indian Foundation) established that "The instruction of Indians should be done in the language of the group to which they belong, as well as in Portuguese, safe-guarding the former" (Law 6.001 - Dec. 19, 1973 - Indian Statute, cited in Rodrigues, 1981 and Vandresen, 1986).

Nevertheless, although public-sponsored bilingual education is law, it has not been put into practice in public schools where education has been exclusively in Standard Portuguese (Meliá, 1979; Rodrigues, 1981, 1988; Vandresen, 1986). Indeed, it was only last year that federal universities in the south of Brazil began to implement the first public-sponsored bilingual education program for immigrant children in all Brazil (Eliane Luz 1988, personal communication). With respect to indigenous groups, attempts at bilingual education programs have been part of scholars' academic discussions and have been promoted as 'alternative' projects developed through the enthusiasm and effort of a few individuals (indigenists, missionaries and university professors).[3]

A Questão da Educação Indígena (The Question of Education for Indians) (Comissão Pró-Indio, 1981) is a collection of fourteen educators' reports addressing the issue of education for Indians in the north, south and mid-west of Brazil. They were presented at "The First National Meeting about Education for Indians" in São Paulo in 1979. The reports are not detailed ethnographic studies, nor thorough analyses of degrees of bilingualism among different indigenous groups, nor typological studies of bilingual education programs that have been developed in Brazil. Instead, what emerges from them is a series of themes and problems evolving out of the teachers' practice and related to the scholars' academic discussions, three of which will be discussed here: 1) bilingual education and the issue of language choice as medium of instruction, 2) the role and function of schooling, and 3) the need to listen to Indians' educational concerns.

Bilingual education and the issue of language choice

In the United States, bilingual schooling is viewed as a means of remedying inequality in educational opportunity for students of no or limited English-language proficiency (minority language groups). A child who comes to school with a home language other than English cannot participate competently in instructional activity primarily because she does not understand what is going on and cannot communicate with the teachers and others in the classroom.

A major issue in the literature in the United States is the function of the native language in the educational process. Supporters of the *transitional* model believe in

the primacy of English, using the native language as a medium of instruction only until the point where the students have acquired competent skills in English. Advocates of the *maintenance* model uphold the long-term use of the L_1 (native language) and the right of students to maintain their native language and culture. Still others favor the *enrichment* model in which the opportunity of becoming bilingual is also open to English-speaking students (Fishman, 1976; Mackey, 1972; Paulston, 1975).

In Brazil, however, two positions regarding the function of language run throughout the literature. One position holds that the native language should be used for development of first language skills, whereas the other holds that Portuguese should be the medium of instruction. Supporters of the former position point out both a technical rationale (developing full proficiency in the L_1 promotes the same in the L_2, because the L_1 reading skills are easily transferred to the L_2) and a political rationale (developing literacy in the L_1 is a way of preserving indigenous languages and cultures, and it is the right of everybody to be literate in their own language). They favor the language maintenance model, arguing against the assimilationist character of the transitional model as the appropriate mode for a society which recognizes and accepts cultural pluralism and desires democracy.

Advocates of the latter position hold that literacy should be achieved in Brazilian Portuguese, making use of arguments provided by Indians that they do not need the written code because their own cultures are orally-based. However they need to learn Portuguese as it is a defensive tool in their contact with the national society. In this case, the main issue concerns the variety of Brazilian Portuguese that is to be used in learning to read and write (the standard, the one spoken by Indians, or the local variety).

After reading these teachers' reports a couple of points become clear. Numerous teachers, in theory, shared the conviction that the use of the native language is necessary for the technical and political reasons mentioned above. In practice not only were most of these programs developed and implemented under precarious conditions, but other factors contributed toward the choice of Brazilian Portuguese as the medium of instruction. Among the main difficulties mentioned were: the recognition that they did not know much of the native language, the lack of research in indigenous languages, the lack of linguistic theory to accompany the practical materials developed by teachers in the indigenous communities, the high level of multilingualism of some groups, and the resistance of some indigenous groups.

Out of twelve reports that discussed problems involving language choice as medium of instruction, five stated that they used Brazilian Portuguese as the only medium of instruction (Guimarães, Lea, Ladeira, Oliveira and Diniz, Pereira). Out of the seven reports that favored the use of the L_1, two fell into the transitional model (de Paula and de Paula, do Nascimento) in which students during the first two years learn the native language as a first step towards making the transition to Brazilian Portuguese. The other five reports favored a language maintenance model. Some of these reports will be discussed in detail below.

Do Nascimento's report is a typical example of the work of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) during the 1970s, in which bilingual education programs were developed for several indigenous groups using the native language as the medium of instruction. SIL's overall project was translating the Bible into indigenous languages and then helping the native speakers of those languages to become literate, so that they could read the Bible in their own language. Today it is generally accepted that the SIL work was assimilationist, having conversion as its main goal (Meliá, 1979; Orlandi, 1983a,b,c, 1985; Rodrigues, 1988).

De Paula and de Paula, although supporters of the language maintenance model, ended up using the transitional model. They mention that they started with the L_1 but they had to stop because of their lack of vocabulary and the problems they were having with syllabic structure and spelling in the indigenous language.

The other five attempted to implement a language maintenance model (Altmann and Zwetsch, Amarante, Azevedo, da Mota, Ferreira) in the sense that they recognized the importance of keeping both the L_1 and L_2 as media of instruction. Whereas Altmann and Zwetsch, and Azevedo introduced both languages from the beginning, Amarante, da Mota, and Ferreira developed programs which were comprised of two phases starting with the L_2 and later introducing the L_1. Amarante mentioned that she started with Brazilian Portuguese and later introduced the L_1 after having evaluated some problems that arose in the first phase of the program, including the exclusive use of Brazilian Portuguese.

As a matter of fact, even the teachers who used only Brazilian Portuguese as medium of instruction (Guimarães, Ladeira, Lea, Oliveira and Diniz) unanimously stated having used the L_1 during the process of early literacy instruction as bilingualism was spontaneous and learners created words in their native language which in turn helped them (the teachers) to develop their own knowledge of the indigenous language. However, they could not go further because their knowledge of the indigenous language was very low.

Amarante pointed out that in the case of the Iranxe group, the introduction of the L_1 was problematic because of certain cultural patterns which vary according to age and sex factors. Most women were not Iranxe (due to exogamic marriages) and they did not speak the language. Because most children were primarily in contact with women, they did not speak Iranxe either. But whereas boys learn it through contact with Iranxe men later during initiation, there is no functional need for the girls to learn it. Therefore the girls have to learn both spoken and written Iranxe in school while the boys do not. On the other hand, Lea (1981) in her work with Txukarramãe Indians in the National Park of High Xingu mentioned that despite the fact that Brazilian Portuguese was the lingua franca there, restricting the use of Portuguese for literacy training to men was inevitable, as most women did not speak Portuguese. Moreover, women did not have an active role in the external social activities of the group which would in turn lead them to interact with non-Indians.

Judging from these studies, there is no consensus about the issue of language choice except for the fact that the choice should be made according to the specifics of each situation. The reports ask for detailed analysis of linguistic situations and the needs resulting from the contact with the national society as well as the motivation and attitude of the specific group to be taught.

The information drawn out of these reports leads one to the conclusion that when carried out in practice, bilingual education in Brazil is either transitional, in which the native language is used as a bridge to Brazilian Portuguese (cf. de Paula and de Paula, do Nascimento, and the work developed by the SIL), or it has been intermingled with the process of *alfabetização* (literacy) itself in which both languages are used simultaneously but restricted to a short period of time. As researchers have argued, one of the components of successful bilingual programs (understood to be the language maintenance model) is that the program should be long enough to provide for a solid linguistic foundation in the L_1, promoting cultural maintenance (Hakuta and Snow, 1986; Troike, 1986).

What all these alternative programs had in common was an effort to intervene in the social problems of indigenous peoples. The authors of these reports believe that education for Indians in which use of the L_1 would be one of the components is strengthening them against the disruptive forces imposed by the contact situation. Education was not to be reduced to school and school to literacy instruction, but it would take up on Freire's (1976) theories which see literacy development as a critical, mobile process through which habits of resignation and conformity are overcome.

Freire has distinguished between a 'naive,' magical, unreflective stage in which man doesn't confront the world around him and a 'critical' vision of this world. He wanted to reform the illiterates' perspective on reality, which has usually been of a profound pessimism and fatalism, by enabling them to gain awareness of their capacity to shape their environment. Accordingly, the teacher's main purpose in the process of *alfabetização* was to make Indians aware of their exploitation by the dominant society and provide them with the tools to fight for their rights. In this case, learning to read was not acquiring a mere technical skill, but acquiring values, formulating mentalities, and led to social and political consequences.

The Freire method (1976) was chosen by most of the teachers as it best fit their purposes to make the transition from the traditional school of the missionaries. In Freire's model the critical capacity of the learners develops out of dialogue about meaningful situations in their life. Both teacher and learners come into close association in a common purpose, seeking truth about relevant problems while respecting each other's opinions. To give one example, Oliveira and Diniz (1981) reported that the elaboration of the material they used in literacy development for adults was prepared jointly by the teacher and learners and distributed in six steps taking into account meaningful situations in the Indians' life. For example: readings of reports and documents about many indigenous groups in Acre, notes about the Indians' accounts of their customs, habits, and work tools, readings of pedagogical materials developed by anthropologists for other indigenous groups, key-words regarding the environment of the group to be taught organized according to their phonemic complexity, elaboration of 42 cards according to the Freire method were used.

The deeply contextual orientation of Freire's method led to basic themes regarding Indians' ways of life in the tribe as well as to problematic issues originating from contact with national society. The following learner's piece of writing (from Pereira, 1981) exemplifies the growing critical consciousness by Indian learners of their situation as exploited people:

Seringa

> No seringal tem pouco serigueiro porque o patrão paga pouco pela borracha e a mercadoria no barracão é cara O seringueiro fica sempre devendo para o patrão. Ele nunca tira saldo. O seringueiro fica sempre mais pobre. Só o patrão é quem ganha com a safra da borracha.
>
> Para o seringueiro não falta o que comer se ele tem criação e o roçado.

Rubbertree

> In the *seringal* (a place where rubber is collected) there are few *seringueiro* (rubber tappers) because the boss pays little for the rubber and goods in the *barracão* (the place where workers buy goods they need) are expensive The *seringueiro* is always indebted to the boss. He never gets the credit. The *seringueiro* always gets poorer. It is only the boss who profits with the rubber crop.
>
> For the *seringueiro* if he raises some cows and owns a *roçado* (a small farm) there is no lack of food.

Accordingly, most of the literacy projects were developed along with projects for "cooperativas de produção e consumo," enterprises which operate for the benefit of those using their service, which intended to help Indians control their land and achieve economic independence. In other words, schools and cooperatives were part of the same process in which *conscientização* (conscientization) was to lead to political action whose aim was to achieve the total integration of the indigenous people into a new society under change. This vision of a new society shared by these educators portrayed the issue of a national Brazilian identity not as a conflict between two identities (one more superior than the other) but as a mutually enriching experience for both.

In support of cultural pluralism, these educators established as their goals: 1) the struggle against ethnic discrimination, 2) the redefinition of social and cultural consciousness of indigenous groups, and 3) the awakening of a critical awareness among indigenous groups of their specific class situation (a product of economic exploitation, political domination and cultural degradation).

The role and function of schooling

A major concern among teachers was the need to distinguish between Western modeled schools and Indian schools. At issue is the whole concept of education. How could one imagine an Indian school which would not destroy indigenous culture and tradition? The first distinction to take into account grew out of the whole concept of education. Education within indigenous communities is continuous and multiple (provided by several members of the communities), and learning does not require formal codes or establishment institutions as the traditional Western school does. Learning occurs by means of spontaneous games and imitation. Everyone learns from everyone else (Meliá, 1979). On the other hand, Western education requires formal and institutionalized codes. Its goal is generalization and homogeneity and the method used is inculcation. On this basis, the question of the role of school can be looked at three different ways.

First, there is a major concern on the part of the teachers in defining the role of the non-Indian educators in the indigenous areas. Teachers are aware of the contradictions and problems posed by the traditional Western school. As supporters of Freire, they have rejected the authoritarian speech of the traditional school viewed as ideologically bound to the dominant ethnic group. Instead, they consider education as a series of processes and activities carried out along with Indians, leading them to a critical understanding of reality, that is, the contact situation.

Second, in an attempt not to reproduce a traditional Western school several teachers make the point that there is no need to have a separate space for school (de Paula and de Paula, Guimarães, Lea) as is the case in traditional Western schooling. They claim that classes should be taught in the *aldeias* (villages) so that school could be entirely integrated with Indians' daily activities without disrupting them. Classes should not be taught, for example, whenever children were travelling with parents, fishing or attending community activities. Frequency should be a question of personal motivation and be supported by community leaders. Accordingly, several reports (da Mota, Guimarães, Lea) discuss the use of indigenous myths as a motivation for oral work. Others (de Paula and de Paula, Ladeira) point out that the technical difference between the way certain Indians do handicrafts (right to left) and write (left to right) should be taken into account. De Paula and de Paula also suggest that school and literacy programs should be introduced only during adolescence when indigenous processes of socialization have been mostly completed. All in all, the main aim expressed in the reports is to design a type of school which does not work against the Indians' traditional process of socialization and in which writing is related to other handicraft skills.

Finally, the preparation of bilingual indigenous monitors constitutes another component of the process of 'nativization.' The teachers assert that the communities themselves should assume responsibility for literacy development as it is the Indian monitor who lives in the *aldeia* and best knows his or her culture and language. School is to be controlled by Indians themselves.

These three aspects reflect a major function of school in indigenous communities posed by these educators, which is to break up the authoritarian discourse characteristic of the traditional school in which the White teacher is the only source of knowledge. The new school is a tool for reflection and *conscientização* (conscientization) of the relationship between Indians and non-Indians (Altmann and Zwetsch, da Mota, Oliveira and Diniz, Guimarães). The new school is the search for autonomy (in Freire's terminology education is the practice of freedom) in which

teachers and Indians construct a critical interpretation of the contact situation through transactions with each other.

Nevertheless, it is interesting that while teachers view the classroom dialogue activity as an important step in building up *conscientização*, some indigenous groups view it as a waste of time (Gnerre, 1985). Several teachers reported that some groups wanted to start writing and reading activities (mostly copying) immediately. Also, while teachers wanted to give classes in the *aldeias*, Indians sometimes want a special building for school as a separate site from the community life. Hornberger (1987) pointed out when analyzing two Quechua-speaking communities of Puno, Peru, that the school, from the point of view of community members, has historically been and should continue to be a non-Quechua site within the community. While teachers were ready to accept absence of students, parents were worried when their children missed a class. The introduction and implementation of the non-traditional school was not easy and smooth, but met with resistance.

The need to listen to Indians' concerns

This third theme is related to the previous ones, that is, Indian Schools should be designed through consultations with the target population to discover their needs. What did the Indians want from literacy? What kind of school did they want? What language was to be preferred in the process of literacy? What were the difficulties posed by institutionalized schools? These were some of the teachers' questions. The teachers proposed schools which would not interfere with cultural patterns in the indigenous communities (favoring the L_1, not having a separate site for school, integrating school activities to their way of life, etc.).

Out of the twelve reports only one is by an Indian, Daniel Matenho Cabixi, titled *"Educação para o grupo Pareci"* (Education for the Pareci group). Cabixi criticizes the schools of the past (board schools run by missionaries in the 1950s, regular schools in the 1960s and 1970s) which never took into account the Indians' cultural values nor ever paid attention to the socio-economic and political crisis resulting from the contact situation. At present, Indians feel the need to have a school for themselves and their children. However, Cabixi states that because of their dependency they still desire the model school they have been accustomed to. He calls for an education which breaks up the path of dependency on national society in which Indians should be enabled to transform themselves and their social environment. In order to succeed they need to have technical and intellectual preparation, and organize themselves and struggle for their rights.

Cabixi recognizes that dispersion of the group, lack of people with experience, lack of funds and pedagogical material specific to the group are some of the major problems. On the other hand, he is critical of anthropologists and linguists who do not engage in the Indians' cause, but just take advantage of their condition to improve their status as researchers, and he is critical of educators who have been working with Indians claiming themselves to be *'conscientizadores,'* supporters of conscientization, but who are merely observers of a deteriorating situation.

Though Cabixi is an Indian, he refers to himself as an outsider. He received a mainstream education in the national university system and has been back in the Pareci community for nine years. He has not learned the native language of the Pareci, making it very difficult for him to understand the true feelings of the Pareci Indians or convey his knowledge to them. Is Cabixi speaking from an Indian point of view? That is very hard to say.

Much of the emphasis in the teachers' reports points towards a language maintenance program. This is demonstrated by their goals, such as the enabling of Indians to a) gain self-determination and responsibility for their own socio-economic development, and b) raise their tribal ethos so that they can maintain their own culture and traditions. Such a bilingual-bicultural program has as a goal the enabling of the indigenous communities to take upon themselves responsibility for their own literacy development.

A critical issue: are we keeping the difference?

The question, "is there bilingual education in Brazil?" has two answers: yes and no. The positive answer refers to the fact that bilingual education is the subject of some scholars' academic discussions (see Meliá, 1979; and UNICAMP, 1983) and the aim of a few projects developed through the enthusiasm and hard work of a few individuals (cf. the alternative programs described above). The negative answer refers to the fact that there is no *publicly-sponsored* bilingual education for Indians in Brazil nor any experimental bilingual projects at a national level. Rather, bilingual education is restricted to individual efforts, and most of these projects, if put into practice, have been interrupted.

A second question, "what kind of bilingual education programs have been developed?" is best answered through the vantage point of two major philosophical orientations, assimilative and pluralistic, which underlie the issue of linguistic diversity, bilingual education, and language policy in the U.S. and around the world (Wolfson, 1988).

The situation in Brazil is not too different from other countries. On the one hand, there are proponents of assimilation who hold that Brazil is a Portuguese-speaking country and that schools should be responsible for assimilating diverse linguistic groups into mainstream language and culture. On the other hand, the opponents of this view hold that Brazil is a pluralistic nation and that the government must protect the rights of minority groups in order to maintain diverse languages and cultures.

Looking at the history of contact between Indians and the national society, the language policy that has been carried out by the government and the recurrent themes discussed above, two trajectories may be identified concerning the assimilationist and the pluralistic viewpoints, one taken by government agencies (GA), such as FUNAI, and another by alternative programs (AP) such as those described above.

Across the centuries up through the late 1960s assimilation was a common goal of the government language policy and the school agents (SIL missionaries and indigenists). The only difference was that while regular public schools offered submersion programs, the missionaries, aiming at conversion, used transitional programs.

But since the 1960s, there has been a change in orientation towards a recognition of linguistic diversity and self determination. Taking Ruiz's (1984) three categories of language policy orientation (language-as-problem, language-as-right, language-as-resource), there has been a move away from language-as-problem towards language-as-right on the part of GAs and APs.[4] Nevertheless, there is a big difference between the two. Whereas GAs have not reinforced the Presidential Acts (whenever FUNAI schools used the first language as medium of instruction it was only for a short period as a bridge towards the L_2), APs have attempted to do so.

There has been a historical mismatch between GAs and APs. Whereas APs seem to keep moving towards a language-as-resource orientation, GAs are stuck with language-as-problem. The teachers described above desired Indians' empowerment and control regarding schooling. These teachers wanted to be mediators in the Indians' process of becoming critically aware. Furthermore, learning was supposed to be a two-way process and the teachers would expand their knowledge about the indigenous languages. (de Paula and de Paula).

However, if we take a close look at the teachers' reports, one has a feeling that despite all their good intentions, they have missed the point. These 'progressives,' though favoring pluralism and diversity, have ended up favoring an assimilationist

orientation. How has this been so? First, throughout the teachers' reports and their discussions about the role of school and literacy, nothing is said about the introduction of literacy into a non-literate society, or about the different strategies inherent in oral and written modes of language use.

The terms *non-literate* and *literate* as well as *oral mode* and *written mode* do not represent a dichotomy but places on a continuum. On this basis, other absolutes such as good and bad, or superior and inferior, do not apply. Researchers have shown that differences among groups either in discourse (Heath, 1982; Michaels, 1981) or in participant structures (Philips, 1983) are not found so much along the great divide of oral vs. literate cultures, but in the gap between decontextualized information present in a mainstream classroom and the native, oral code used for organizing and conveying information in non-mainstream homes (See Hornberger, 1988, for a comprehensive discussion of the concept of continuum in the biliteracy, literacy and bilingualism literatures).

I am not questioning the value of literacy. I do not believe that it is possible for an indigenous group or any group thrust into a technological world to isolate themselves from the influence of literacy and exist as a 'pure' culture. Culture is not static. The point to make is that the process of moving from oral traditions to the written word is a process of language reduction whenever oral forms are translated into written form, a process which has historically been Western-shaped. By using the Freire approach, which has been designed for syllabic languages such as Portuguese and Spanish, these teachers have transposed a structure of syllabic languages onto languages which may have different syllabic structures or may even be non-syllabic. It was not by chance that de Paula and de Paula reported that they could not continue their work with the L_1 as a medium of instruction; they noted that they were having trouble with words whose syllabic structure was different from Portuguese.

Accordingly, Gnerre (1985) has pointed out that it is naive to think that it is useful to translate school texts, which are the result of a specific historical and linguistic tradition, from Western languages to indigenous languages. He says that although writing in a native language or using it as a medium of instruction has been a crucial element in the process of ethnic maintenance for several indigenous groups, the assumption of this approach is that indigenous languages can convey the same information as the Western language. It is of crucial importance that educators begin to face the issues regarding the homogenization process inherent in using the Western written code. Following this same argument, Orlandi (1983c) has claimed

that the new approach launched by teachers aiming at language/culture maintenance turns out to be assimilationist and ethnocentric, as they have not made a distinction between their concept of language (Western-oriented) and what would be the Indians' relationship with language.

While Gnerre focuses on the problems and consequences of the introduction of literacy to a pre-literate society, Orlandi draws on a typology of discourse to make the point that the conflict between authoritarian and critical discourses is part of the Western experience with teaching/learning in formal schools. Understanding this conflict does not mean that authoritarianism is taken away, but that it may take the shape of paternalism. According to Orlandi (1983a) the bottom line of the "listen to Indians" approach turns out to be "listen to Indians in order to modify them according to the Western-oriented model: the literate adult" (Orlandi 1983a: 128). Orlandi (1983a) presents the situation where Indians who have been in a contact situation are "listened to" but still ask for a traditional Western school. Orlandi suggests that providing a Western school for these Indians would not mean reproducing an unequal or inappropriate situation.. A critical posture would show the Western school as it really is with its contradictions and leave an opening for Indians to elaborate their own experience with it, if they wish.

On this basis, the most important contribution Orlandi makes is her redefinition of the "listen to Indians approach." According to her, listening to Indians means to focus on the Indians' relationship with language by recognizing and accepting that they are active learners who are able to pose questions to themselves as well as use their own hypotheses or methodologies to answer questions.

Along these lines, the language maintenance model implemented by alternative programs which appears at first to have a pluralistic intention, turns out to be only pseudo-pluralistic. A true pluralistic approach would encompass, accept and maintain difference as a way of modifying or making Westerners re-evaluate the concepts they work with. It is a language-as-resource orientation which offers this true pluralistic perspective and which would lead us to abandon the 'understanding' position reflected in the acceptance of conflict/difference in the maintenance model. Perhaps it would encourage an empowering, enriching environment for people to practice the freedoms and the plurality of meanings that language and life offer.

Ethnocide, meaning the destruction of a culture, is a historical constant not only in Brazil, but wherever one culture dominates another. Otherwise, why should we need to bother about language maintenance or enrichment programs? Otherwise,

why should linguists be bothered to come to Brazil to teach Indians how to read and write in their native language? Otherwise, why has the discourse of 'self-determination,' 'empowerment,' 'political organization,' 'maintenance of difference,' 'resistance,' 'consciousness,' etc. been incorporated into Indians' discourse? Finally, (bi)literacy and empowerment is not something *given* to others. We cannot empower others. Instead, both empowerment and literacy are complex interactional processes which are personally and culturally shaped. They are a function of relationships and contexts.

Empowerment is a developmental process. Teachers must be patient and recognize the limits of classrooms for achieving empowerment. Hornberger (1987) has made the point that a societal context in which primary incentives exist for the use of one, two, or multiple languages and the autonomy of the speech community in deciding about use of languages in their schools are essential for successful language maintenance planning. Certainly in Brazil the case has been one of the absence of both these prerequisites across the centuries and despite "all good intentions" we still think that the literate elite of Western societies is or should be the model.

---

[1] This paper was originally written for a class on bilingual education taught by Dr. Nancy Hornberger at the University of Pennsylvania. The author is very grateful to Maria Inês Pagliarini Cox, who offered her helpful insights on the subject of this paper, and to Dr. Nancy Hornberger, who provided helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. However, mistakes remain the author's own.

[2] Franchetto and Leite (1983) reported at the Thirteenth Brazilian Meeting of Anthropology in 1982 that when several academic researchers were asked by what means they started to work with indigenous languages, they responded that is was by chance. Information about indigenous languages/cultures was not provided before students had reached undergraduate and graduate courses or studied abroad. Also, Rodrigues (1983, 1988) has called attention to the fact that linguistic diversity is ignored by most of the population who take it as something old-fashioned which should be eradicated. IBGE, the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics, does not include in its national census questions about which languages are spoken by the population. This lack of information about reality has political and linguistic consequences, such as: the Ministry of Education has never had interpreter service or a section that looks at the education of minority language groups.

[3] The major supporters of alternative programs are the National Museum of Rio de Janeiro, the University of Campinas (UNICAMP) in São Paulo and the Council of Indigenists and Missionaries (CIMI) in Brasília.

[4] *Language-as-problem* - an orientation which has as its status-planning goal the eradication of a minority language. Its corpus-planning goal focuses on

standardization. When implemented it favors transitional bilingual education. *Language-as-right* - An orientation with the status-planning goal of recognition of the rights of communities to maintain their language. Its corpus planning goal includes graphization of minority languages. When implemented it favors maintenance bilingual education. *Language-as-resource* - An orientation with the status-planning goal of development and preservation of as many minority languages as possible. Its corpus planning goal considers the extension of the minority languages both lexically and sociolinguistically. When implemented it favors enrichment bilingual education and literacy training in the minority language (Hornberger, 1987:125).

References

Altmann, Lori and Zwetsch, R.B. (1981). Projeto de educação para o grupo Suruí, Rondônia [An education project for the Surui group, Rondonia]. In Comissão Pró-Indio (Ed.). A Questão da Educação Indígena [The Question of Education for Indians]. São Paulo, Brazil: Brasiliense.

Amarante, E.A.R. (1981). Uma "escola" Myky-Iranxe [A Myky-Iranxe "school"]. In Comissão Pró-Indio (Ed.). A Questão da Educação Indígena [The Question of Education for Indians]. São Paulo, Brazil: Brasiliense.

Azevedo, Marta Maria (1981). O programa de alfabetização do projeto Kaiowá-Nandeva [The literacy program for the Kaiowá-Nandeva project]. In Comissão Pró-Indio (Ed.). A Questão da Educação Indígena [The Question of Education for Indians]. São Paulo, Brazil: Brasiliense.

Cabixi, D. M. (1981). Educação do grupo Pareci [Education of the Pareci group]. In Comissão Pró-Indio (Ed.). A Questão da Educação Indígena [The Question of Education for Indians]. São Paulo, Brazil: Brasiliense.

Comissão Pró-Indio (1981). A Questão da Educação Indígena [The Question of Education for Indians]. São Paulo, Brazil: Brasiliense.

Da Mota, Clarice Novaes (1982). Indios do norte de São Paulo e uma quase experiência de educação indígena [Indians from the north of São Paulo and a quasi-experience of education for Indians]. In Comissão Pró-Indio (Ed.). A Questão da Educação Indígena [The Question of Education for Indians]. São Paulo, Brazil: Brasiliense.

De Paula, L.G. and de Paula, E.D. (1981). A escola tapirapé [A Tapirapé school]. In Comissão Pró-Indio (Ed.). A Questão da Educação Indígena [The Question of Education for Indians]. São Paulo, Brazil: Brasiliense.

Do Nascimento, Zaida Maria (1981). A escola Kaingang do setor Missão em Guarita, Rio Grande do Sul [A Kaingang school of the Mission in Guarita, Rio Grande do Sul]. In Comissão Pró-Indio (Ed.). A Questão da Educação Indígena [The Question of Education for Indians]. São Paulo, Brazil: Brasiliense.

Ferreira, Mariana K.L. (1981). Uma experiência de educação para os Xavante [An educational experience for Xavante]. In Comissão Pró-Indio (Ed.). A Questão da Educação Indígena [The Question of Education for Indians]. São Paulo, Brazil: Brasiliense.

Fishman, J. (1976). Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Freire, P. (1976). Educação como Prática da Liberdade. Brazil: Paz e Terra. Appears in part in Education for Critical Consciousness (1986). New York: Continuum.

Gnerre, M. (1985). Linguagem, Escrita e Poder [Language, writing, and Power]. São Paulo, Brazil: Martins Fontes.

Guimarães, Susana Grillo (1981). Uma escola no Xingu [A school in Xingu]. In Comissão Pró-Indio (Ed.). A Questão da Educação Indígena [The Question of Education for Indians]. São Paulo, Brazil: Brasiliense.

Hakuta, K. and Snow, C. (1986). The role of research in policy decisions about bilingual education. NABE News, IX.

Heath, S.B. (1982). What no bedtime story means: narrative skills at home and school. Language in Society 11 (1), 49-76.

Hornberger, N. (1987). Bilingual education and Quechua language maintenance in Highland Puno, Peru. NABE 11 (2), 117-140.

Hornberger, N. (1988). Becoming biliterate: what do we know? Paper presented at "The Right to Literacy" conference sponsored by the Modern Language Association, Ohio State University and the Federation of State Humanities Councils, September 16-18.

IBGE (Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística) (1950). Estudos de Estatística Teórica e Aplicada/Estudos Sobre as Línguas Estrangeiras e Aborígenes Faladas no Brasil (Studies of Theoretical and Applied Statistics/Studies of Foreign and Aboriginal Languages Spoken in Brazil). Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Serviço Gráfico do IBGE (based on the census of 1940).

Ladeira, Maria Inês (1981). Atividades da escola da aldeia Guarani da barragem, São Paulo [School activities of the Barragem Guarani village, São Paulo]. In Comissão Pró-Indio (Ed.), A Questão da Educação Indígena [The Question of Education for Indians]. São Paulo, Brazil: Brasiliense.

Lea, Vanessa (1981). Um projeto de alfabetização na língua portuguesa elaborado para os índios Txukarramãe (Kayapó) do Parque Nacional do Xingu [A literacy project in Portuguese designed for Txukarramãe (Kayapó) Indians of the National Park in Xingu]. In Comissão Pró-Indio (Ed.). A Questão da Educação Indígena [The Question of Education for Indians]. São Paulo, Brazil: Brasiliense.

Mackey, W.F.A. (1972). A typology of bilingual education. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.). Advances in the Sociology of Language, II. The Hague: Mouton.

Meliá, B. (1979). Educação Indígena e Alfabetização [Indigenous education and literacy]. São Paulo, Brazil: Edições Loyola.

Michaels, S. (1981). Sharing time: Children's narrative styles and differencial access to literacy. Language in Society 10: 423-42.

Oliveira, Maria da Conceicao Maia and Diniz, Keilah (1981). A escola Kaxi [Kaci School]. In Comissão Pró-Indio (Ed.). A Questão da Educação Indígena [The Question of Education for Indians]. São Paulo, Brazil: Brasiliense.

Orlandi, E. P. (1983a). Para quem é o discurso pedagógico? Temas para ciências humanas [To whom is the pedagogic discourse? Themes for social sciences]. In A Linguagem e o Seu Funcionamento. São Paulo, Brazil: Brasiliense.

Orlandi, E. P. (1983b). Tipologia do discurso e regras conversacionais [Typology of discourse and conversational rules]. In A Linguagem e o Seu Funcionamento. São Paulo, Brazil: Brasiliense.

Orlandi, E. P. (1983c). Algumas considerações discursivas sobre a educação indígena [Some discourse thoughts about indigenous education]. In Cadernos de Estudos Lingüísticos 4 - Lingüística Indígena e Responsabilidade Social [Working Papers in Linguistic Studies 4 - Indigenous Linguistics and Social Responsibility]. Campinas, Brazil: UNICAMP.

Orlandi, E. P. (1985). Pátria e terra: o índio e a indentidade nacional [Nation and land: Indians and national identity]. Campinas, Brazil: UNICAMP.

Paulston, C. B. (1975). Ethnic relations and bilingual education: Accounting for contradictory data. In R. Troike and N. Modiano (Eds.). Proceedings of the First Inter American Conference on Bilinguagl Education. Arlington, Va: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Pereira, Claudia Netto do Valle (1981). A escola indígena da casa do índio em Rio Branco [The Indian School of *Casa do Indio* in Rio Branco]. In Comissão Pró-Indio (Ed.). A Questão da Educação Indígena [The Question of Education for Indians]. São Paulo, Brazil: Brasiliense.

Philips, Susan (1983). Invisible Culture. New York: Longman.

Rimbaud, Arthur (1983). Uma Estadia no Inferno (Une saison en enfer). Bilingual edition in French and Portuguese. Translation from French by Ivo Barroso. Second Ed. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Civiliazção Brasileira.

Rodrigues, A. D. (1981). Política lingüística e educação para os povos indígenas [Linguistic politics and education for indigenous people]. In Comissão Pró-Indio (Ed.). A Questão da Educação Indígena [The Question of Education for Indians]. São Paulo, Brazil: Brasiliense.

Rodrigues, A. D. (1983). Línguas Indígenas: a questão política, cultural, e lingüística [Indigenous languages: the political, cultural and linguistic issue]. In Boletim Abralin 3. Campinas, Brazil: UNICAMP.

Rodrigues, A. D. (1988). O tronco Macro-Je [Macro-Je family]. In Porantim, Ano III, March (2).

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in Language Planning. Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education, 8(2): 15-34.

Troike, R. (1986). Improving conditions for success in bilingual education programs. Prepared for the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives.

UNICAMP (1983). Cadernos de Estudos Lingüísticos 4 - Linguistica Indigena e Responsabilidade Social [Working Papers in Linguistic Studies 4 - Indigenous linguistics and social responsibility]. Campinas, Brazil: UNICAMP.

Vandressen, P. (1986). Bilingual communities in Brazil. In Anais do encontro de Bilingüismo. Florianópolis, Brazil: UFSC.

Wolfson, N. (1988). Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL. New York: Newbury House.

Peer groups and the language of negotiation[1]

Joanne Drechsel

This paper examines the oral and written language used in peer groups working on draft revisions. There is a brief review of the literature dealing with peer groups and language usage. A study involving college-age students illustrates the characteristics of a language of negotiation that is integral to the draft revision process, especially in small peer groups. The implications for writing pedagogy are then briefly explored.

Writing groups of one kind or another have been in existence for more than two hundred years and yet, as Gere (1987) points out in her comprehensive history of writing groups, we are continually discovering them. This is certainly true for writing groups in the English classroom. Within the past ten years, writing theorists and researchers have begun to take a closer look at the interaction of group members, especially those members who involve themselves in giving and receiving draft revision suggestions.

Of the research to date that deals with peer groups, the majority of the studies focus upon the effectiveness or the efficiency of these groups. Few studies on English-speaking students have scrutinized the actual language of peer response groups. Danis (1980, 1982), Gere and Abbott (1985), and Gere and Stevens (1985) have attempted to describe and categorize the types of oral responses students give and receive in draft workshops. Gere and Stevens (1985) evaluated student talk for idea units and then coded the language according to function, general focus of attention, and topic of utterance. Danis (1980) found that student talk about drafts fell into five main categories: development of ideas, focus, language, mechanics, and organization. My own classroom research (1988) supported the findings of Danis in that the participants focused their talk on revision issues involving content and language rather than microstructural concerns such as grammar and punctuation.

An unexpected finding in that study, however, was the occurrence in oral and written responses of modal verbs that made those responses function as directives. Often such utterances were preceded by complimentary phrases such as "I like your opening paragraph," or "That's good," while the modal forms contained the revision suggestions and were similar in construction to the following: "You

could put more description in about the party," or "Don't you think you ought to make it clearer?" It was apparent that this language form provided group members with a powerful tool for negotiating revisions and that the social context of the group itself had provided the students with an opportunity for exploring and shaping language to meet their needs.

Bruffee (1984), who has done extensive work on the value of collaborative learning, has noted that talking in groups presents the students with language that they can "internalize" and later "re-externalize" in their writing. Pica and Doughty's research on the use of group work in ESL classrooms indicates that ". . . group work can be effective in promoting the kinds of interaction which involve negotiation of message meaning" (1985: 246). However, the researchers stress the importance of a definite task, one that "compels individuals to negotiate meaning rather than simply inviting them to participate in conversation" (246). These researchers are speaking of the richness of language learning that peer groups can provide. But aside from learning the formal syntactic structure of language through peer interaction, another form of language which I call the language of negotiation seems to arise and become influential in successful draft revision groups. It is this language that my present study explores.

The Study

The purpose of this study was to observe, record, and describe the oral and written interaction of participants in draft revision sessions in order to quantify the use of embedded imperatives (modal verbs), hedged language forms, and unmarked directives used to affect revisions, and then to evaluate the effectiveness of their usage in promoting draft revisions.

This study was conducted on a state university campus during the fall semester 1988. Subjects for the study were 19 freshmen enrolled in a first-year writing course. They ranged in age from 17 to 21 and were homogeneous in social and economic status. Students did not know each other at the beginning of the semester. Classes met three times a week for fifty-minute sessions.

Data were collected from audiotape recordings of two different speech situations. Gumperz (1972) defines speech situation as the social context in which utterances are made. For this study, one speech situation that was utilized was that of students and instructor (the researcher) engaged in a fifty-minute revision session within the classroom. Both the students and the instructor sat in a large circle. Copies of three students' drafts were distributed to members in the group

and then each writer in turn was asked to read his/her draft aloud to the class. With this task completed, class members were asked to respond orally by asking questions, suggesting revisions, or commenting on any aspect of the writer's inability to communicate clearly. No formal checklists were used. The writers were also urged to articulate their concerns or to solicit help from the group members.

A second speech situation was a small peer group (three students) who chose to meet in the university library. The instructor was not present during this group's fifty-minute session. Their task was to read each other's drafts and to offer revision suggestions. For both of these speech situations, the speech event (Gumperz, 1972) was the same: conversation about draft revisions. Speech act, as defined by Gumperz, is the way in which ideas are communicated in language. Austin (1962) and Searle (1976) suggested that there are a limited number of ways to communicate ideas in speech. Five speech acts were proposed by Searle: representatives, directives, commissives, expressives and declaratives. The present study is concerned with directives and how they are employed by group members to encourage revisions of their peers' drafts. As Hatch and Long (1980) comment, Searle's notion of directives includes imperatives as well as questions, thus demonstrating that although language forms may vary, their function may remain the same. For example, a student may use any of the following sentences to achieve the same result--getting the writer to add more description:

Ex. 1: Add more description. [unmarked imperative]
Ex. 2: You could add more description. [embedded imperative]
Ex. 3: What does her dress look like? [interrogative]

Another type of data was the students' written responses to their peers' drafts. The students in this study routinely met in small groups to evaluate each other's drafts and to suggest revisions. The process involved completing a set of three response forms. The first form, Writer's Analysis of Draft, asked the writer to characterize the draft, to list strengths and weaknesses, and to request specific help from the reader in reformulating, revising, or editing the work (see Appendix A).

A second form, Reader's Response to Draft, asked the readers to identify the draft's main idea, to list strengths and weaknesses, and to respond to the writer's request for revision suggestions. Each writer had two readers who completed this form and returned it to the writer who then had the option of accepting or rejecting the suggestions (see Appendix B).

The third form, Writer's Response to Peer Evaluations, was completed by the writer after revising the draft at home. Writers were asked to identify the peer responses that they considered most helpful, least helpful, and which suggestions they acutally used to develop or improve their final paper. This information was used to determine what types of language were used to affect the revision (see Appendix C).

These sources of data--audiotapes of speech situations, written response forms, students' drafts, revisions, and the researcher's field notes--were utilized in this study.

Analysis

The two speech situations were transcribed and, along with the written response forms, coded for directives. In order to do this, it was necessary to identify form, function, and context in keeping with Searle's (1976) speech acts. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) also stress the necessity of defining the situation in order to understand the fit between the syntactic structure and the discourse. Using this as a basis for interpretation, four language forms emerged and were identified because of their illocutionary force as qualifying as directives. These forms comprise two basic classes: direct and indirect imperatives. The direct form, or unmarked imperative, is represented by such student comments as "Use more pronouns," and "End the paper the same way you started it." The indirect class is composed of three categories and includes embedded imperatives with modal verbs, hedged forms, and interrogatives that direct the writer's attention to weaknesses which prevent clear understanding. Examples of these forms follow:

Embedded Imperatives: This *might* need some rephrasing.
You *could* move this right up there.

Hedged Forms: *Just* sum up your whole paper and say 'because of the crime'--
I thought *maybe* that first paragraph could be a *little* more developed.

Interrogatives Used as Directives: Why twenty years ago? [Directive: Add more detail]
Is the story going to be in the past tense or the present? [Directive: Change your verb tenses]

The utterances qualifying as directives were quantified for each of the speech situations and also for the Reader's Response forms. The various modal

verbs and hedged forms were grouped in order to detect a prevalence of any specific form. Table 1 quantifies the classes and categories for the speech situation that involved students and instructor. This data does not include the speech of the instructor.

Table 1

Language of Negotiation in Classroom Speech Situation with Students and Instructor

	% of Directives	Number of Directives
Direct Imperatives	2%	1
Indirect Imperatives	98%	41
-Hedged	69%	29
-Embedded	22%	9
-Interrogatives	7%	3

The results show that when offering revision suggestions, students preferred the use of indirect imperatives and in particular the use of hedged forms (69%). Of these hedged forms, the word "like" was used 33% of the time.

The second most often used form for this speech situation was the phrase "I think" or "I don't think" along with the word "just." The following examples are taken from the students' oral responses and demonstrate how these words were used as directives.

Ex. 1: I *think* she could go on, *like* put more examples in.
[Directive: Add more examples]

Ex. 2: When you were *like* talking about earthquakes and everything? I'm not sure I get it *like*--I know they're going to be there--it's their job.
[Directive: Clarify the meaning]

Ex. 3: I *think* an example *like* she says that *like*, 'By the time I got to the light it was yellow then just turning red' that's *like* slang. I mean, *like* I got to laughing--.
[Directive: Formalize the language]

Ex. 4: . . . *just*--shorten it up a little.
[Directive: Be concise]

The most frequently used modal verb (10%) in this speech situation was the word "should."

Ex. 5: I think she *should* put that more forward in the essay rather than at the end.
[Directive: Reorganize the essay]

Ex. 6: Or *shouldn't* like it be informal--I mean formal?
[Directive: Change the tone]

Although this speech situation consisted of 19 students and an instructor, the student interaction and language production was generated by 7 students. The instructor's comments are not tallied in with this data, as this was not the focus of the study. It is interesting to note, however, that the instructor preferred the use of modal verbs (53%) to hedged forms (47%) when responding to student drafts. The most frequently used modal by the instructor was "should," while the hedged form was "I think (you need)." These last two forms reflect the student preferences and possibly indicate the extent to which the instructor represented a model for language in this classroom session.

The second speech situation, three students meeting in the university library without the instructor, is quantified in Table 2. Long et al. (1976) found that when peers work without the instructor present, they tend to produce more language. If this is true, then the library group should have produced more language of negotiation. Audiotape recordings of the two speech situations allowed for the quantitative comparison of the utterances in these social contexts.

Table 2

Language of Negotiation in Small Group Speech Situation with Students Meeting Outside of Classroom

	% of Directives	# of Directives
Direct Imperatives	2%	2
Indirect Imperatives	98%	91
-Hedged	71%	66
-Embedded	23%	21
-Interrogatives	4%	4

The results of the quantification of the utterances from this second speech situation showed 93 forms qualifying as directives. Of these forms, 91 were classified as indirect imperatives. Students preferred the hedged forms (71%) over the modal verbs (23%) and the interrogative forms (4%). The most frequently used hedged form was the word "just," which was used 24 times (26%). The following are examples of this usage.

Ex. 1: It sounds better if you *just* say this is necessary.
Ex. 2: You could *just* rephrase that first sentence.
Ex. 3: Maybe *just--just* make it clearer.

Another frequently used hedged form was the phrase "I don't know" or "I don't understand" which seemed to allow the speaker to pose as a non-authority but yet give a directive.

Ex. 1: Well, then, *I don't know* if this is right, but maybe you can like cut some of these examples out--put some of this right after each other--this is good.
[Directive: Reorganize and be concise]

Ex. 2: Uh, *I don't understand* this sentence. I don't really. *I don't understand* it. Maybe you didn't even finish it.
[Directive: Clarify the meaning. Note that the speaker provides an excuse for the sentence's apparent ambiguity thus lessening his critical evaluation of the sentence]

The word "like," which appeared in 33% of all imperatives in the classroom speech situation, was employed in 9 utterances (10%) by the small group. Modal verbs were used in 21 utterances with the most frequently used word "could" representing 9% of the total indirect imperatives. The following examples show their usage.

Ex. 1: Um--you *could* say 'take American politics for example.'
[Directive: Change wording]

Ex. 2: You *could* just rephrase that first sentence.
[Directive: Rewrite the sentence]

A comparison of total utterances of the two speech situations showed an increase in the quantity of language of negotiation in the small group that met in the library. There were 42 utterances (direct and indirect) for the classroom group and 93 utterances for the library group. Both groups met for the same length of time (fifty minutes). An increase of 51 utterances corroborates Long's (1976) findings about the quantity of language production in small groups.

Having concerned itself with establishing the presence of language of negotiation, this study then attempted to analyze the effects of such language on actual revisions. One student's draft which was discussed by the small peer group in the library was followed through to the revised version. What follows are excerpts from the student's draft, the oral responses given to her by the peer group, and her revised version.

Draft: From a very early age, people in this society are taught to trust each other as a way of living and live most of their lives following this standard of belief in their fellow beings. Children, as a prime example, will trust their parents to tell the truth when asked a question.

PEER (P): (Reads this portion of the draft and comments) Okay, let's start off--ah--this sentence [he reads in a muffled voice]. When you use that example in there, it *really doesn't really* fit in.

WRITER (W): I know.

P: *Just* use, 'It should not be understood that by trust I do not [sic] mean blind'--you don't *really* need an example in there.

W: Okay.

P: You *really don't* need that . . . .

W: Okay.

Revision: From a very early age, people in this society are taught to trust each other and live their lives following this standard of belief in their fellow beings. It should be understood that by trust I do not mean blind faith. Instead, I speak of the element of simple faith that one person has in another.

In the above example, the writer has taken the peer's suggestion and incorporated it into her own text in order to qualify her use of the word "trust" in the essay. The writer evidently knew that something was not right with the original text for she readily accepts the needed lines. In the excerpt below, W (the writer of the draft) has included in her first paragraph a discussion on the trust that children have in their parents. P (the responding peer) talks with her about the issue.

P: . . . I *guess* they trust them to guide them, but it's--I really don't have much of a choice.

W: I know.

P: Yeh. It's *like* you can say that stuff, but then you can say well--

W: They're taught that way.

P: They don't--they don't have any--if they don't trust their parents then--

The conversation continues between the two students as they discuss children and their trust in parents. P indicates that perhaps older children--teenagers--do not always trust their parents. The conversation ends as follows:

W: Do you think I should leave it out?

P: *I don't know. Maybe just--*

W: Maybe just shorten?

P: *Just* make it clearer that--

W: A short paragraph?

P: *Maybe* make it clearer--like older children. Okay, so [he laughs and then goes on to the next section of the paper].

P's comments cause W to omit the entire paragraph from her final paper. P's hedging--"Maybe just," and "I don't know"--have created enough dissonance for the writer that she decides that the example is faulty and should be eliminated from the essay.

Another area of W's paper allows P to respond to it through a personal experience.

Draft: When in a store and ready to check out by purchasing one's goods, people trust that no one is going to just step in front of them in line. Also, when they get to the cashier, they trust that the cashier will not overcharge them or try to unjustly keep some of the change.

P: Ah, let's see. This example there. That people trust the cashier to give them the exact change all the time and stuff like that. *I don't know.* I was a cashier for awhile [laughing] and nobody trusted me [laughing]. They didn't trust--they'd be looking over everything. 'Was that on sale? Was that on sale? Did you overcharge me?' 'No, I didn't. I'm giving you the right price.' *I don't know* about that one! Like people don't--they don't trust--well they may trust cashiers, but maybe they don't trust that the cashiers won't make a mistake or something because most people do watch very closely.

Later in the transcript P refers back to W's example of the cashier.

P: But I think it's good [referring to her whole essay]. *Maybe just--maybe just* that one about the cashier.

W: Okay.

P reads the draft further and asks about some words that W has scribbled on the paper. She tells him that they are "just some ideas jotted down."

P: Just jotted down. That's good. Let's see, umm oh, *maybe--just* to replace the cashier one, you can say 'people trust their lawyers in court' or something like that.

Again the comments made by P cause W to eliminate this example from her final text. Along with his hedged forms and his "authority" as a former cashier, P's referring back to this example twice also reinforces his position that "maybe--maybe just that one about the cashier" should be revised.

In the transcript and W's draft, there is additional evidence of peers' influence on the revisions that are made. One final example follows. In this case, the use of modal verbs are employed by P. The writer has realized that she has a paragraph that "contains a couple different ideas." P agrees that it "probably *could* --probably *would* be a good idea to expand a *little* bit." After re-reading the paragraph, he notes how W has "jumped from place to place all over the place." He then adds, "I'd like to see you develop that one about the jobs a *little* more. Because that's a good one." W has a sentence dealing with employer-employee relationships and then two sentences about crossing the street, and then back to the employer-employee trust.

Draft: For many jobs in which there is not a fixed salary, employees trust their employer to pay them a correct hourly wage for the exact amount of hours worked. Also there is the trust one has in others everytime he or she crosses the street . . . . Trust can be encountered not only in such simple things, but also in serious parts of your life. When one seeks a job and goes to the interview for it, the employer trusts that the resume completed by the person is accurate and true.

P: You *could* put his--'when a person goes for a job, for an interview'--you *could* put this up here with the other thing because they're both dealing with the same thing--the employer and the employee. So you *could* do that. You *could* move this right up there. And then you *could* go--this crossing the street thing here and then go into--use this and then go right into the doctor.

Revision: Trust can be encountered in various other forms also. Such a situation might occur when a person is in pursuit of a job and goes to the interview for it. The prospective employer usually trusts that the resume completed by that person is accurate and true. Likewise, for many jobs in which there is not a fixed salary, employees trust their employer to pay them a correct hourly wage for the exact amount of hours worked.

W has revised her draft through a reorganization of paragraphs and ideas. P's language of negotiation appears to have brought about this change. The above

examples provide some evidence of the power that language of negotiation has over draft revisions.

The final source of data for this study came from the written responses that students gave to each other when they met in small peer groups within the classroom. Reader's Response forms were coded for language of negotiation in order to permit quantification of direct and indirect imperatives. Table 3 summarizes this data into the total number of suggestions offered, total direct and indirect imperatives, and the total number of each of the forms that caused writers to revise their drafts. This information was taken from the Writer's Response to Peer Evaluations form.

Table 3

Language of Negotiation in Students' Written Responses

	% of Directives	# of Directives	% Utilized	# Utilized
Direct Imperatives	15%	8	2%	1
Indirect Imperatives	85%	45	68%	36
-Hedged	36%	19	32%	17
-Embedded	32%	17	28%	15
-Interrogatives	17%	9	8%	4

Embedded imperatives and hedged forms combined to produce the majority of language forms used to influence draft revisions. Although 15% of the forms were evaluated to be direct imperatives, only 2% of the revision suggestions offered this way were actually used by the writers. Embedded and hedged forms were written in similar quantities (32% and 36% respectively); whereas, in the speech situations mentioned above, students showed a marked preference for hedged forms. The most frequently used embedded imperative was the word "could" which was written 12 times (22%). The second most often written indirect imperative was the hedged form "little." In some cases, students used both "could" and "little" in the same directive. What follows are two examples of how revision suggestions were given by the reader (Reader's Response form) and received by the writer (Writer's Response to Peer Evaluation form).

Ex. 1: READER: *Could* add a *little* more detail in paragraph 2.

WRITER: I used a little more description where it was needed to make the paper run smooth. One reader says to add a little more detail in the 2nd paragraph so I combined

the first two paragraphs.

Ex. 2: READER #1: I *think* 3rd and 4th paragraphs and 5th and 6th paragraphs *should* be together as 2 paragraphs.

READER #2: Last sentence, 3rd paragraph *could* be 1st sentence 4th paragraph.

WRITER: They told me that I didn't group my paragraphs well. I changed my paragraphs and lengthened them also.

Even in the students' written responses, indirect imperatives abound and are accepted as the norm for negotiating changes in drafts. Notice the interpretation that the writer above forms from the two readers' responses. Apparently students have no difficulty in interpreting this language and sifting out the directives.

Findings

In order to analyze the differences between the two speech situations and among the speech situations and the written responses, Table 4 is used to summarize the classes and categories of utterances which qualify as imperatives. It becomes apparent then that when students participate in draft revision sessions and are given the opportunity to discuss each other's drafts, they typically use a language rich in hedged forms. It does not seem to matter whether students are in classrooms or engaged in discussion about drafts outside of the classroom. They still use the same form in their language.

Table 4

Totals for Speech Situations and Written Response Forms

		%	#		%	#
Student/ Instructor:	Direct Imperative	2%	2	Indirect Imperative	98%	40
				-Hedged	69%	29
				-Embedded	22%	9
				-Interrogatives	7%	3
Student/ Student:	Direct Imperative	2%	2	Indirect Imperative	98%	91
				-Hedged	71%	66
				-Embedded	23%	21
				-Interrogatives	4%	4
Written Response:	Direct Imperative	15%	8	Indirect Imperative	85%	45
				-Hedged	36%	19
				-Embedded	32%	17
				-Interrogatives	17%	9

What is significant, however, is the quantity of language generated in the small group without the instructor. This group of three students produced 93 utterances which qualified as directives as compared with the classroom group of 19 students who produced 42 directives. Students who met in this small group reported having received more in-depth feedback from their peers and having felt more relaxed in the informal setting. Perhaps, then, the social context was conducive to the production of greater peer interaction and thus more language.

The benefits of small peer group interaction for language production can also be seen in the greater variety of modals and hedged forms used in this social context as compared to that of the classroom group and the writers of the response forms. If, as this limited study indicates, the use of language of negotiation enhances the likelihood of revisions, then it would seem prudent for an instructor to include small group interaction as part of the writing course's format.

When data from the response forms are compared with the data from the speech situations, the most noticeable difference is seen in the reduction of hedged forms used in written responses. These writers seem to balance their directives between the use of modals and hedged forms. Regardless of the form used, responders do expect that their suggestions will be implemented in the revised paper. The researcher has observed proofreading sessions in which comments such as "That worked out good," and "It reads smoother now," indicated the satisfaction of the peer who suggested the revisions.

But why do these writers and speakers find indirect imperatives so useful? And why are direct imperatives generally avoided? A partial answer to the first question may be found in the research of Brown and Levinson (1978) who proposed two categories of politeness for classroom use. Positive politeness has as its emphasis the "solidarity" of teacher-student and student-student rapport. On the other hand, negative politeness or "politeness-deference" tends to reduce the teacher's or student's "imposition" on the listener (reader). Brown and Levinson identify nine forms of speech that qualify for their negative politeness category. Four of these forms appear in the data collected on the subjects in this study. Included are indirectness ("I'd like to see you develop that one about the jobs a little more."), minimizing the size of the imposition ("Just sum up your whole paper and say ...."), use of distance markers ("I would say the third paragraph--she says that a social convention ...."), and the use of hedges, as seen throughout this study.

The use of negative politeness allows a reader or speaker to objectively evaluate a draft without offending the writer of it. The use of distance markers,

especially found in the classroom group, tend to separate the author momentarily from the critical remarks themselves, thus making them less threatening. It should also be noted that college freshmen enter a course usually not knowing many, if any, of their classmates and then see them for only fifty minutes three times a week. This fact in itself promotes a negative politeness among students. The absence of negative politeness may account for some of the failures of peer groups, especially those composed of younger students who spend time together in and out of the classroom. Negative politeness appears to be a learned strategy arising from life experiences. Whatever its origin, it plays an active and useful role in some peer response groups.

This study has focused upon the language used to negotiate draft revisions and has identified two general classes, direct and indirect imperatives, and yet students only occasionally resort to direct imperatives in their discourse. One reason for this could stem from the students' past experiences with using directives in situations outside the classroom; another touches on the writers and their sense of authority over their written texts. Successful peer response groups, through their language of negotiation, allow the authors of the texts being evaluated to retain this authority because they offer suggestions in such a way that the authors are free to accept or to reject the ideas. One student wrote the following comment after receiving indirect imperatives that alerted her that her essay did not flow smoothly.

> All comments are helpful to me. I may not always follow their suggestions, but I always listen to them. I changed some of my sentences so that the transitions between them was smoother. I also rephrased many sentences.

Language of negotiation, then, provides a source of mediation between writers and responders and enhances the author-text-reader relationship by acknowledging the authors' rights to their own texts.

Implications

Data from this study serve to emphasize the importance of group interaction during revision processes. Language of negotiation, which appears to be a natural component of college students' discourse, is something that could be modelled by instructors of writing. Its power as a tool for promoting revisions should be remembered when comments are written on the students' drafts and revisions. We instructors already know what power we wield with our direct imperatives. But perhaps we should reflect upon the importance of empowering our students with a

sense of ownership over their writing. By doing so, we will have taken a step toward balancing the unequal power that exists in the classroom.

---

1 This paper was written for the course "Classroom Discourse and Interaction" taught by Teresa Pica, University of Pennsylvania, Fall 1988.

Appendix A

WRITER'S ANALYSIS OF DRAFT

Name _____ Essay # _____

1. How would you characterize your draft at this point?

2. List those strengths and weaknesses that you have found in this draft.

STRENGTHS WEAKNESSES

3. What would you like your readers to focus on at this time? How can readers help you reformulate, revise, or edit your work? (Be specific)

Appendix B

READER'S RESPONSE TO DRAFT

1. What do you think is the main idea of your classmate's draft?

   Reader #1 (name) _____

   Reader #2 (name) _____

2. List those strengths and weaknesses that you have found.

	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
Reader #1		
Reader #2		

3. Please respond to your classmate's request for suggestions.

   Reader #1

   Reader #2

Appendix C

WRITER'S RESPONSE TO PEER EVALUATIONS

Name _____ Essay # _____

1. What kinds of responses from your readers were most helpful? Be specific.

2. Which were less helpful? Why?

3. Which suggestions did you use to help develop/improve your final paper?

References

Austin, J.L. (1962). How to Do Things with Words. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena. In E.N. Goody (Ed.). Questions and Politeness: Strategies in SocialInteraction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruffee, K.A. (1984). Collaborative learning and the "conversation of mankind." College English, 46, 636-652.

Danis, F.M. (1980). Peer response groups in a college writing workshop: students' suggestions for revising compositions. Dissertation, Michigan State University.

Danis, F.M. (1982). Weaving the web of meaning: interaction patterns in peer response groups. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Composition. March 18-21, 1982.

Drechsel, J. (1988). Peer response groups and the language of revision. Unpublished paper, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Gere, A.R. (1987). Writing Groups: History, Theory, and Implications. Illinois: Southern Illinois Press.

Gere, A.R., & Abbott, R.D. (1985). Talking about writing: the language of writing groups. Research in the Teaching of English, 19, 362-81.

Gere, A.R., & Stevens, R. (1985). The language of writing groups: how oral response shapes revision. In S. Freedman (Ed.). The Acquisition of Written Language. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Gumperz, J.L. (1972). Introduction. In J.L. Gumperz & D. Hymes, (Eds.). Directions in Sociolinguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hatch, E. & Long, M.H. (1980). Discourse analysis, what's that? In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.). Discourse Analysis in Second Language Acquisition Research. Rowley, MS: Newberry House.

Long, M.H., Adams, L., McLean, M., & Castanos, F. (1976). Doing things with words--verbal interaction in lockstep and small group classroom situations. In J. Fanselow & R. Crymes (Eds.). On TESOL '76. Washington, DC: TESOL.

Pica, T. & Doughty, C. (1985). The role of group work in classroom second language acquisition. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.). Foreign Language Learning in a Classroom Setting. Special issue of Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 1985b, 7, 233-48.

Searle, J.R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. Language in Society. 5, 1. 1-23.

Sinclair, J. McH., & Coulthard, R.M. Towards an Analysis of Discourse. London: Oxford University Press.

"In Chinese Way, .../ko+i:uwn/": An analysis of the interlanguage of Yihwen Kuo[1]

Jeanne J. Newman

This paper describes the interlanguage use and variation of Yihwen Kuo, a native speaker of Taiwanese who has been in the United States for almost four years. By using taped samples of his oral English as the data for analysis, three styles of language-learner language are identified for this subject. Sociolinguistic factors which may influence his choice of styles are examined and commented upon.

The findings which are presented in this paper represent an investigation and analysis of the English interlanguage of Yihwen Kuo, who explained the differences between American and Chinese naming practices as follows: "In Chinese way, I should say /ko+i:uwn/. But see, in Western way, you put last name on back. So I spell it Y-I-H-W-E-N., Yihwen and last name K-U-O, Kuo, Yihwen Kuo."

Yihwen Kuo is a native of Taiwan who came to the United States three years and eight months ago (at the time of recording) for the purpose of doing his Master's degree in Fine Arts at the University of Southern Illinois. He is a ceramics instructor at a small art school in Philadelphia and the recorded samples of his language which I had to work with were obtained at three different times but under similar social situations; i.e., during the period of time that he was 'on duty' as an instructor of ceramics. Yihwen possesses an idiolect, his interlanguage, which is a full and complete system with rules and language elements adequate to express his present English language needs.

> According to Wolfson, (1981:1) Language, both as medium and subject of study, is more than a system of sounds, meaning units, and syntax, more than simply a tool for getting meaning across. More than anything else, language is a social behavior, and it is upon this fact that sociolinguistics is predicated. And, ...it would appear that stylistic variation in speech is universal. This being the case, it stands to reason that learners of English will, so far as they are able, vary their speech behavior in an attempt to speak appropriately in the differing speech situations in which they find themselves. (4) and, ...No one speaks the same way all the time. (5).

Hudson, in describing the social nature of speech refers to speech as 'skilled work', "...since it requires effort, and its degree of success depends on the effort that is made." (1980:113-114). Also, the functions which one requires one's speech to

serve are directly related to the success with which the function (work) is performed, and, "...one of the reasons why some people perform particularly well in some situations is that they have learned very specific skills for use in those situations,...". This aspect of functionalism certainly can apply to Yihwen's use of more complicated grammatical structures during his demonstration, which is an activity that as a ceramics instructor he has performed many many times. He has learned the English required to describe the processes involved in doing a wheel thrown pot.

The term *interlanguage* was first used by Selinker (1972) to discuss "the structured system which the learner constructs at any given stage in his development." This is the same concept called *approximative systems* by Nemser (1971) and *idiosyncratic dialects and transitional competence* by Corder (1971). Nemser (1971) clearly stated three assumptions basic to interlanguage theory which are summarized in Ellis: 1) the interlanguage system of a language learner has clear differences from both the L_1 and L_2; 2) the systems are an evolving series; and 3) there is a close coincidence in the interlanguage systems of learners at the same stage of development.

Judd sees language as "...an aspect of social behavior, with rules which are strongly conditioned by context" (1983:234). Important aspects of context which must be considered when conducting discourse analysis to discover sociolinguistic conditioning factors include: setting; participants, including age and sex and relative social status of those involved; time; presence or absence of audience; and the purpose, or desired goal of the speaker. All of these external circumstances can and do influence speech performance. The significance of my study is that most of these sociolinguisticly variable conditions were held constant for all three taping sessions. The audience varied, but this variable is closely tied to goal, since during the demonstration the hoped-for audience was the entire class which was grouped about Yihwen's potter's wheel. During the other two taped segments, the same people were present for potential audience but he was not necessarily speaking to their ears or for their benefit. I can therefore claim with confidence that the single most important contextual variable which conditioned these three different styles of interlanguage was the goal of the speaker, since the language variation described in this paper was observed under circumstances as identical as feasible. The physical setting was the same (the ceramics studio of the art school), the role of the speaker was the same (as ceramics instructor), the role of the audience was essentially similar (as students in his class) and, his topic was the same (ceramics). Only his

purpose (language goal) varied. In the interview he was supplying me with supplemental personal information and of the three language samples, this one most closely resembles what Labov would call *the vernacular.* In the demonstration, he was describing verbally what his audience could see taking place at the wheel and during his 'advertising blurb' regarding an art show, elements of his language are remarkably like a 'canned speech'. For example, at one point I interrupted him to ask a question, and after answering my question he then backtracked to his previous point and repeated, word-for-word, the utterance which had preceded my interruption!

Hymes describes the language use variability deriving from the users understanding of language appropriate to a particular situation as an integral part of communicative competence (in Ellis, 1971: 77), and the user's knowledge of when, where and with whom to use certain language rules needs to be examined in terms of performative or communicative competence.

Labov (1970) lists five axioms about language use study, two of which are appropriate to this study and are summarized in Ellis: 1) all speakers possess several styles and their speech is adaptive to fit the social context; and 2) styles can range along a single dimension, which Labov measures by amount of attention paid to speech. The important points to consider are, according to Ellis (1986), that variation is systematic, governed by both situational and linguistic factors and that the user's variation can be explained in terms of governing factors which are sociolinguistic and which determine which variants are used where, when and how. The fact that variation is systematic in natural languages is undisputed; however, the claim that interlanguage represents a natural language (an idiolect) is somewhat novel, yet the same types of variability are evident in interlanguages as in natural languages. Yihwen's situational variation, evident by his selection of certain grammatical structures for use in the demonstration that do not occur at all under different situational circumstances, can be compared to Labov's continuum of speech styles ranging from vernacular to careful speech. (see also Tarone, 1983).

The fact that Yihwen's language development can be described using the term *interlanguage* does not detract from the point that his present language system is complete. As a transitional system, Yihwen's interlanguage exhibits situational variation which demonstrates the sociolinguistic phenomenon of 'language variety according to context'. It is probable that Yihwen is capable of producing more varieties of English than I have been able to observe and record, since my association with him is only in his role as instructor. However, since ceramics is his

field, a reasonable assumption is that his language use in this subject represents his most sophisticated register. And, in fact, my findings demonstrate that he uses a level of interlanguage during demonstrations which is marked by a more advanced level of vocabulary, syntax and grammar than is evident in other verbal interactions.

When I examined the transcripts, it became evident that although these language samples were all obtained under similar situations, the goal had affected his production. A different language goal had resulted in different styles of language. The three speech events in which I obtained recorded segments of his language are: Interview, Announcement and Demonstration. It was not immediately obvious that I had obtained three registers which varied according to communicative goal. Yihwen's phonology, which is perhaps the most noticeable element in the language production of a second language learner, does not show perceptible variation from one style to another, but his treatment of /l/ in variation with /r/ is interesting and is included in this study.

In comparing Yihwen's language use in the three taped segments, it is clear that the nature of the task (goal) determines the kind of language-learner language that he uses. There is no question that the style used in the demonstration is a much different style of interlanguage than that used in either the announcement or the interview, and that this can clearly be related to the physical involvement of Yihwen with his clay. This is the sort of situational factor Ellis was referring to; and I would say that physical activity does influence language acquisition, which is fully explored by Asher (1977), who developed his whole theory of Total Physical Response in second language acquisition around just this concept. To summarize some major points: interlanguage is variable with the same speaker demonstrating a range of language styles which move from casual unplanned to formal planned discourse. Learners systematically vary their choice of interlanguage forms according to whether the situation calls for unplanned discourse (the interview) or careful style (the announcement). Intense monitoring is likely to result in the learner using his most advanced interlanguage forms. Thus fewer errors occur in the announcement (canned speech) than in the interview or in the demonstration.

The findings which are presented in this paper represent an investigation and analysis of the English interlanguage of Yihwen Kuo. Yihwen's communicative competence is variable according to the goal of his speech act, and it is this variability in his interlanguage which I have focused on for intensive analysis. The analysis consists of an examination of the subjects use of various parts of speech and

grammatical structures. In Quirk and Greenbaum, varieties of language according to subject matter are referred to as 'register'. "...the use of a specific variety of one class frequently presupposes the use of a specific variety of another" (1973:6). In other words, since Yihwen's demonstration variety includes grammatical elements not present in the other two types, we ought none-the-less to assume that the elements of this variety are available to him for use in other situations. Quirk and Greenbaum list two sets of parts of speech: closed-system items made up of articles, demonstratives, pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions and interjections, and open-ended items made up of nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs. It is with these lists of parts of speech that I initiated my analysis of Yihwen's language use.

It appeared at first that there was no pattern or system in the subject's use of the various parts of speech. However, an interesting phonological distinction became immediately clear. As is often the case with native speakers of Chinese, Yihwen has the sounds of /r/ and /l/ as allophones of the same phoneme in most cases, and the following anecdote from one of his classes illustrates the sometimes comic repercussions of this lack of phonological distinction in his English.

Ann, a student in Yihwen's Saturday morning class needed to leave quite early one morning and in explaining her need for speed mentioned that she and her husband were going to New York that afternoon. She then disappeared around the corner into the Glaze room and Yihwen called after her:

Ex. 1 Yihwen: Are you glazing?
/r+yuw+Krezin/

Ann: (not hearing his /n/ ending)
No, we have to go. . . . . Oh!...You mean glazing?

Much laughter followed from all present, as the misunderstanding was instantly apparent to the English speaking observers.

This becomes especially interesting in my analysis because not once does this phonological variation occur in the word clay! This provides the evidence necessary to state that sociolinguistic factors govern his performance. It is important to Yihwen that he produce the sounds of English related to his chosen field with perfection, and although he is probably unaware of the allophonic nature of /l/, /r/ in some other English lexical items, in the word *clay* there is no variety.

I began my analysis of Yihwen's use of the various parts of speech by making several copies of the transcript which I then worked through methodically highlighting all instances of each of the indicated parts of speech. I then isolated

the instances by listing separately each targeted lexical item showing what immediately preceded and followed the item. It was during this stage of my analysis that it became apparent that I had obtained a distinctively different style of language in the demonstration segment. For example, present progressive tense is used extensively in the demonstration segment, but only once in the announcement and only twice in the interview. The two usages in the interview are entirely correct when compared to standard English usage but I believe the occurrences in that context can be attributed to 'chunking'. For example the two examples given below constitute phrasal idioms. However the nine usages within the demonstration segment occur minus the appropriate form of BE, as does the single usage in the announcement.

Ex. 2 the world *is getting* smaller.

Ex. 3 I'm *looking for* teaching job.

This leads me to believe that Yihwen learned the English he needs in order to practice his art, as meaningful chunks (which could be compared to an actor learning lines) and that he is largely unaware of his production in these circumstances. His language proficiency has become more sophisticated as he has spent more time interacting with English speaking students, and this sophistication becomes apparent in his language use since the only instance of his using the present progressive tense with all its necessary elements occurred in the interview which, according to my own classification as well as the relevant literature, represents the least monitored with the least possibility for advance planning of these three speech styles.

This same methodology was used to isolate for examination and analysis the following other items which are included in this study:

Articles: the, a, an
- inappropriate usage
- omission in obligatory context

Prepositions:
- inappropriate item selection
- omission in obligatory context

Verbs: conjugated verb forms, two part verbs and infinitive forms
- inappropriate use
- omission in obligatory context (e.g., part of a two part verb missing)
- tense or part of tense missing

Nouns: common and proper:
- inappropriate use of sing./pl.
- absence of appropriate article or demonstrative

Pronouns:
inappropriate use.
omission in obligatory context
Adjectives:
comparatives
variety of selection
Adverbs: used as intensifiers
Modals including *DO*:

For the sake of brevity I provide here a summary of items reported by negative exception. In other words, I have included only a count of items which represent non-standard usages. It is interesting to note that Yihwen's usage in addition to demonstrating sociolinguistic variability also is an excellent example of language learner language variability as a function of developmental acquisition. None of the errors reported here are 100% consistent throughout his language. Each error is in variation with the appropriate Standard English form to varying degrees, and the Standard English usages outnumber his errors in every instance except his use of the progressive tense minus BE. Since Yihwen used this tense correctly and completely in the interview segment, I feel that it is only a matter of time until he restructures his *demonstration register* to include BE wherever appropriate. Since he has constructed his *demonstration register* to be a verbal accompaniment to his visual work with the wheel, his choice of present progressive is obviously the best possible English structure. An overt act so simple as having his *demonstration register* described and analyzed during the course of this study may be all that is necessary for him to pay close enough attention to his language production that he will overcome this language development plateau. I believe that he learned this functional English at a time previous to his present level of acquisition due to the professional language need he had at that time. The demonstration language has served him well and his major attention is on the wheel throwing process so it may take such conscious attention to his language to correct this use in the *demonstration register*.

Summary of Items by Negative Exception

Articles: The problems exhibited with articles are two fold in that he inserts *a* or *the* where none is required (six instances) or he omits the article in obligatory context (sixteen instances). This misuse is consistent with other studies of Chinese speakers acquiring English as an L_2, and findings generally show that Chinese learners prefer no article which results in a grammatical structure borrowed into their English interlanguage from the L_1.

Prepositions: There is a minor amount of confusion regarding appropriate use of *in*, *on*, or *at* in these transcripts, and a single instance of omission in obligatory context. These infrequent errors do not interfere with his communicating in English with his students.

Verbs - Conjugated: The most noticeable non-standard feature of Yihwen's verb forms is his failure to produce word final stops in contexts which require past tense. It is difficult to determine on the basis of the present data whether this is a phonological deletion of voiced and voiceless stops in word final position which affects his verb forms only, since final stops are present in other places, or if this is a grammatical deficiency, i.e.: he simply hasn't acquired past tense yet.

There are seven instances of a single word final stop where two are called for in past tense in words such as graduate, and there are sixteen instances of present tense being used where the context requires past. These errors occur in a group of frequently used irregular verbs such as BE, HAVE, SEE, GIVE, MAKE, which would seem to support an insufficient learning hypothesis, however there is one clear instance of final stop deletion, also with an irregular verb where the vowel change has taken place, but the word is left unfinished: "...what bra (brought) me here..." A careful phonological study certainly is called for here, as close inspection has revealed that Yihwen deletes the final stop ending under very special conditions. If the word ends in a stop or fricative, plus or minus voice, Yihwen fails to add the stop ending. This analysis of his usage of verb forms also reveals twenty instances of omission of the appropriate form of BE, ten of them in the present progressive tense.

Verbs - Two Part Verbs: Yihwen's two part verbs occur during his demonstration register except for one occurrence during the interview of an idiom chunk (I'm looking for) which reinforces my theory that his demonstration register represents acquisition *chunks* needed for his professional performance in English. His use is entirely Standard English form except for one omission of *to* ,"...you want -- take a look?"

Verbs - Infinitive forms: All instances of non-standard usage involve omission of *to*, and except for one occurrence during the 'Art Show Advertising blurb' are within the *demonstration register* segment.

Nouns - Common: Non-standard usage here consists of the inappropriate use of singular or plural with items like *two month*, or *those clays* (speaking of a lump of clay, not several varieties), and the omission of the appropriate article or demonstrative.

Nouns - Proper: Yihwen's only deviation from totally Standard English usage of proper nouns occurred when he was talking about his studies at Southern Illinois University when he stated "...usually the Master degree, Master Fine Arts is the highest." Standard English would make the phrase possessive: Master's degree. In one other instance he mentions, "I got a Fellowship in the Clay Studio." which Standard English would change to: at Clay Studio, and a few pages later he refers to a Museum as being located: "...in the Penn's Landing" which Standard English usage would change to at Penn's Landing.

Pronouns: There are fourteen instances of inappropriate usage of pronouns, and these instances consist mainly of using plural pronouns where singular are required. In seven instances a pronoun is omitted in obligatory context, and in all seven cases it is the pronoun *it* which is omitted.

Adjectives: a. Comparatives. Yihwen does not exhibit any non-standard use of adjectives. Since he does use the superlative with the forms *highest* and *most*, I will assume he has this form available to him for use if he chooses. Also used appropriately is the form *too much*. b. Variety of selection. His variety of selection is rather small, but I have only taped his 'Ceramics Instructor' code, and I feel certain he has others available to him for other social circumstances. Present in the language samples that I have recorded are cardinal and ordinal numbers, and even though a complete set is not present, they can be assumed to be present because of the ones he uses correctly. The number of other adjectives which he often stacks (e.g. thinner and thinner and thinner) or uses with adverbs (very, very, tiny, tiny foot) seems a quite small list, but he tends to use his few favorites over and over throughout the transcript.

Adverbs: Yihwen uses adverbs to intensify and his list is even smaller than the adjectives which he uses but as with the adjectives, he uses them stacked and repeats the same few with great frequency.

Modals: There is no instance of inappropriate use, but there are six instances of omissions in obligatory context.

DO: *Do* exists in its Standard English form for Yihwen as a full verb, however his use of DO support is not consistent, and represents a variable use rule for which I have to date discovered no conditioning or controlling factor as an explanation. This would seem to qualify his use of DO support as in free variation with its absence in obligatory contexts. According to Gatlionton (1978), free variability can be explained using the diffusion model which allows for incremental acquisition in several steps while the learner sorts out the appropriate form-function relationships.

This description of Yihwen Kuo's interlanguage needs to be tentative indeed not only because of the small size of the language samples but also because of its narrow scope, his Ceramics Instructor code. These samples consist of only 208 language learner utterances with at total of 2,120 individual morphemes. I did an utterance and a morpheme count with the thought that average length of sentence in the three samples might add evidence to my claim for three styles, and while there is an increase in morpheme count per utterance in the demonstration, the difference is not dramatic so I consider it inconclusive. The interview segment has an average sentence length of 9.83 morphemes; the demonstration segment has an average sentence length of 11.91 morphemes; and the announcement segment has an average sentence length of 8.25. The single solid piece of evidence that I have for my claim that his *demonstration register* represents an arrested code for him which is different from his other language use and subject to developmental acquisition is his use of the present progressive. However since this linguistic item's usage is so dramatically tied to the language goal, I cannot help but feel that additional study would yield additional evidence.

---

1 The original draft of this paper was written for a class in Second Language Acquisition taught by Dr. Teresa Pica at the University of Pennsylvania.

References

Asher, J. (1977). Learning Another Language Through Actions: The Complete Teachers Guide Book. Los Gatos, CA.: Sky Oak Productions.

Bolinger, D. (1975). Aspects of Language. 2nd ed. New York: Harcort Brace Jovanovich.

Cook, V. (1971). The analogy between first and second language learning. in R. Lugton, (Ed.). Toward a Cognitive Approach to Second Language Acquisition. Philadelphia, PA: Center for Curriculum Development.

Corder, S. (1971). Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis. International Review of Applied Linguistics. IX:149-59.

Ellis, R. (1986). Understanding Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gatlionton, E. (1978). Patterned phonetic variability in second language speech: a gradual diffusion model. Canadian Modern Language Review 34: 335-47.

Hudson, R. A. (1980). Sociolinguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jakobovits, L. (1970). Foreign Language Learning: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of the issue. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Judd, Elliot L. (1983). The problem of applying sociolinguistic findings to TESOL: the case of male/female language. Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition. Series on Issues in Second Language Research. Nessa Wolfson and Elliot Judd (Eds.) Cambridge: Newbury House.

Labov, W. (1970). The study of language in social context. Studium Gererale 20:30-87.

Labov, W. (1972). Sociolinguistic Patterns. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Nemser, W. (1971). Approximative systems of foreign language learners. International Review of Applied Linguistics. IX: 115-23.

Quirk, R. and Greenbaum, S. (1973). A concise Grammar of Contemporary English. London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage International Review of Applied Linguistics. X: 209-30.

Tarone, E. (1979). Interlanguage as chameleon. Language Learning 29(1): 181-192.

Tarone, E. (1983). On the variability of interlanguage systems. Applied Linguistics. 4:2 143-63.

Wolfson, N. (1989). Perspectives Sociolinguistics and TESOL. Newbury: Newbury House.

Qualifiers in patient-physician discourse: An analysis of interviews from radio call-in programs[1]

Jennifer Stevens Pappas

This paper reports on a study which investigated how qualifiers are used in radio medical call-in shows. It offers some support for the hypothesis that physicians qualify their medical advice in ways which could impede effective communication.

Recent studies of physician-patient discourse indicate asymmetries in the distribution of speech acts by patients and physicians. Compared to patients, physicians: say more (Shuy, 1976), ask more questions (Frankel, 1984; Hatch, 1980; Todd, 1984;), ask more narrow questions (Mischler, 1984), answer questions less often (West, 1984), accomplish more speech acts per turn (Todd, 1984), interrupt more often (Frankel, 1984), and maintain greater control over the initiation and termination of topics by their use of questions and reactives(Mischler, 1984; Todd, 1984). While the definition of what is valid and relevant information is negotiated by the patient and physician, physicians appear to dominate the process (Frankel, 1984; Mischler, 1984). It is hypothesized that one way physicians maintain greater control over the interaction is by their more frequent use of qualifiers, which make their assertions less disputable.

The term "qualifiers" will be used to refer to words and phrases which are used to indicate the level of approximation of propositional content or the level of speaker commitment to the proposition. Qualifiers which suggest approximation or uncertainty regarding the core assertion (i.e., the unqualified part of the assertion) will be defined as "hedges." More generally, to hedge can be defined as "to protect oneself from losing by a counterbalancing transaction" (as in to hedge a bet) or "to evade the risk of commitment especially by leaving open a way of retreat" (Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1985). Qualifiers which emphasize the typicality or severity of attributes or which indicate speaker confidence in a core assertion will be called "intensifiers." And assertions which include neither hedges nor intensifiers will be considered "unqualified."

Bonanno (1982:36) defined hedges as words or phrases which convey speaker uncertainty (e.g., "kinda pinkish," "I guess," "I think"). In a study of discourse between female patients and physicians of both genders, Bonano found that patients used hedges more frequently than physicians and that female physicians used

hedges more frequently than male physicians. She concluded that patients used hedges when they "had difficulty remembering or when reference was made to topics that the patient felt uneasy about or wanted to avoid." There was some evidence to support the hypothesis that hedges and other forms of indirect speech (i.e., euphemisms, vague intensifying adjectives, and tag questions) hindered the effective exchange of information. However, the lack of data on male patients and the lack of discussion of physicians' hedges limit the conclusions which can be drawn from this study.

In a study of discourse between physicians, Prince et al. (1982) identified four ways physicians hedge their assertions: (1) "rounders" which suggest ranges or confidence intervals for quantitative information, (2) "adaptors" which indicate that the case in question is similar but not identical to some prototype, (3) "plausibility shields" which suggest that the speaker is not fully committed to the assertion or that the assertion is based on plausible reasoning rather than deductive logic, and (4) "attribution shields" which attribute the assertion to another person, named or unnamed. Examples of each type are given below:

Rounder:	"She weighs *about* 45 pounds."
Adaptor:	"It was *sort of* blue."
Plausibility shield:	"*It seems like* it is blue."
Attribution shield:	"*According to her* it was blue."

The first two types represent hedges with the content of propositions (i.e., approximated numbers or qualitative attributes) and the other two represent hedges regarding the speaker's commitment to or ownership of a proposition. the researchers found that physicians used hedges frequently, that hedges were used in reference to medical as well as ethical issues, and that adaptors and shields were more frequent in statements which included other markers of uncertainty (such as self-repairs). They concluded that these types of hedges represented true markers of uncertainty and were not merely colloquial phrases which had lost their meaning through repeated use. The results of their study suggest the following questions about the use of hedges in medical discourse:

(1) Do patients and physicians use hedges differently ?
(2) Do hedges represent different levels of certainty?
(3) Are hedges used more often than markers of certainty?
(4) How are multiple qualifiers used and interpreted?

The study of qualifiers may be useful for: (1) discovering the rules of evidence which underlay medical discourse, (2) identifying one source of power physicians have over the interaction, and (3) ultimately, for identifying the effects of such

communication strategies on the ability of patients and physicians to fulfill their objectives for the encounter. However, the goals of this study are narrower: to describe how qualifiers are used and to suggest further research to determine which assertions are disputable, on what grounds, and by whom.

Contextual Factors in Radio-Based Medical Interviews

This study examines an atypical form of medical interview: encounters between physicians and patients on a radio talk show. One of the ways the radio-based encounters differ from private medical interviews is that there are at least three additional participants: a moderator who manages the introductory greetings and the closing acknowledgements, the moderator's staff who screen the calls and the members of the radio audience whose silent "presence" is likely to affect the performance of both the physician and the caller.

From the moderator's point of view, the primary purpose of the program is to engage the interest of the listening audience by: (1) letting callers describe typical or interesting medical problems so (2) the physician can offer diagnostic and treatment information which will (3) educate and entertain the radio audience sufficiently to (4) maintain or increase the number of listeners. The market share determines the (5) commercial advertising rates of the show and (6) ultimately affects the profitability of the radio station.

From the physician's point of view, the program offers an opportunity to display professional expertise which will enhance his own reputation and the reputation of his profession, his speciality, his subspeciality (or areas of expertise), and his group practice or affiliated institution. Satisfying the concerns of individual callers may be less of a priority than educating the listeners about medicine but each caller represents an important opportunity to display the knowledge, advice, interpersonal skills, and communication skills that the physician imagines the listeners want from a physician.

For the caller, the program offers an opportunity to obtain free diagnostic and therapeutic advice including the possibility or referrals to medical practitioners. In addition, the caller has the option to remain anonymous; callers are referred to by first names only, they rarely give their last names, and some have admitted that they have given false first names. The lack of a fee and the potential for anonymity may make it easier for some callers to introduce issues which they would hesitate to share with their own physician or which have not been answered by other physicians. On the other hand, there are probably more constraints (legal and customary) on what

can be discussed on radio than on what can be discussed in a private medical interview. The main function of the show for the caller remains similar to that for a typical medical interview; to get a first or second opinion on a current health concern.

The potential for conflict between the objectives of the participants in typical medical encounters is increased when there are additional participants and objectives (Tannen and Wallat, 1982). Some of the potential conflicts will be noted below because they may affect the types of assertions and qualifications which are expressed and may therefore limit the generalizability of the findings to more typical medical encounters. First, there is a contradiction between the intimacy of the physician-patient dialogue and the "presence" of the larger listening audience. The moderators of similar shows sometimes refer to this conflict when they attempt to calm a nervous caller by saying, "Don't be nervous, it's just you and me," occasionally adding "and a thousand other folks who will understand." More importantly, the physician has a dual audience and can thus be expected to direct many of his remarks to both audiences.

Second, there is a potential conflict between the medical/educational objectives and the commercial/entertainment ones. The moderator tends to emphasize the educational rather than the commercial objectives; it is the frequent commercial breaks which remind the audience of the underlying financial objectives. The conflict is apparent when a commercial break interrupts a discussion of a serious issue, such as child abuse, suicide, or terminal illness. Moderators often try to ease the transition with an explanation of why a commercial is necessary. The moderator may say "we must take a break now in order to pay the bills": or "to serve those who make this show possible," in an attempt to make the transition from personal tragedy and crass commercial lingo less jarring for the audience. Similarly, there is potential conflict between the assertions of the physician and those contained in commercial messages. One of the physicians in this study expressed skepticism about manufacturers' claims about their skin care products. If there had been commercials about such products, the conflicting claims could have caused more hedging by the physician and more confusion for listeners. (For this study, only the patient-physician dialogue was examined; the commercials and moderator-physician dialogues which occurred between the interviews were not examined.)

Third, there is the conflict between the objective of having physicians provide reasonable answers to caller questions and concerns and the physicians'

lack of access to the visual cues and medical record information which are often required for diagnosis. As physicians attempt to give useful, appropriate, and accurate information based solely on patient's verbal reports of their problem, they can be expected to make more than the usual number of hedges (though probably fewer than in physician-physician discourse where potential challenges might be more threatening to the physician's sense of his own competence). In this sense, the radio-based encounters may offer a better source of information on how physicians hedge their assertions even though some of the criteria for the hedges will be different (i.e., the lack of visual cues) from those in face-to-face encounters.

There are two other potential sources of conflict which are not unique to the radio-based encounters but which could affect the patterns of discourse. First, the physician may have dual objectives: (a) to prove that his type of expertise is useful and (b) to help callers help themselves in order to reach a state of health which reduces the need for professional intervention. (Labov and Fanshel, 1977; Waitzkin and Stoeckle, 1972). Second, a physician may feel conflicting obligations to (a) challenge advice given to patients by other physicians (when he considers it inaccurate) and (b) to refrain from criticizing a fellow health professional. When diagnostic or treatment information is disputable, the physician is more likely to (1) recommend physician intervention than self-diagnosis or self-treatment and (2) to question the patient's report of the information than to question the reported judgment of their physician (see Katriel and Nesher, 1987, for similar conclusions about tutors and student-callers on an Israeli radio call-in program) While this study does not focus on the actual challenges (there were few), these two sources of conflict may affect the types of qualifiers which are used by physicians.

In summary, while the context for radio-based encounters is different from that of face-to-fact medical interviews, it is likely that the radio-based encounters will manifest some patterns of discourse which are typical of medical interviews (Katriel and Nesher, 1987). Physicians are likely to rely on patterns of interviewing developed through years of training and practice and therefore are likely to unintentionally display some of the best and worse aspects of (their) usual medical encounters. Similarly, it can be assumed that most callers bring to the encounter extensive knowledge of medical interviews in terms of what kinds of assertions are appropriate and defensible (Frankel, 1984; Mischler, 1984).

Methods

The data for the study consist of tapes of 14 interviews from two radio call-in programs which featured physicians who answered questions from callers. The six interviews with the pediatrician concerned children with weight problems and all of the callers were parents of such children. The eight interviews with the dermatologist included discussions of skin problems which had been experienced by the caller or a close relative of the caller. The sampling of interviews was arbitrary in the sense that the researcher taped all of the interviews which occurred after she was notified that the talk show was in progress (after the first few interviews in each case). The tapes were transcribed with attempts to retain and identify the dysfluencies and unaudible phrases.

Unlike face-to-face medical interviews, radio-based interviews yield tapes of encounters which offer the researcher almost all of the information and cues which were available to the participants. Except for the nonverbal communications between the moderator and physician, all communication was aural and most was verbal. The lack of visual cues in the physician-patient encounters can be expected to modify the nature of the discourse, for it makes the participants more dependent on linguistic (and vocal) forms of communication and excludes diagnostic evaluations which depend on visual cues. This study is limited to analysis of the lexical features of the encounter except where rising intonation suggested questions and where nonlexical utterances such as laughs and "uh huhs" could be represented in the transcript.

The unit of analysis varied depending upon the nature of the qualifiers examined. Unlike previous studies which have reported the number of qualifiers per minute or per interview, the number of qualfiiers in these interviews was compared to the number of assertions which *could be* qualified. For the analysis of rounders, the units of analysis were assertions which referred to numbers. For other types of qualifiers, the units of analysis were complete assertions.

Hedges: Rounders

According to Prince et al. (1982), rounders are used to suggest ranges of values where greater precision is unavailable or irrelevant. In these interviews, it was expected that physicians and patients would use rounders and that physicians would use them more frequently since physicians are more likely to be aware of: (a) potential measurement errors, (b) variability in physiological conditions over time, and (c) the difficulty of interpreting the meaning of a single numerical value (e.g., a

lab test result) without additional diagnostic data or repeated measurements. Further, physicians were expected to use all types of hedges more often than callers, since their knowledge base is probabilistic and their assertions have more serious consequences for the listeners.

Of 67 references to numbers, 57 were single numbers and 10 were reports of specific ranges of values (e.g., "from 1941 to 1964," and "less than a centimeter"). Where specific ranges were reported, there were no rounders. While the use of rounders was not precluded in assertions about specific ranges of values, the lack of rounders suggests that the range was deemed to offer sufficient approximation without additional qualifiers.

In the references to single numbers, the frequency of rounders varied by the type of variable discussed (see Table 1). The fact that none of the references to age included rounders reflects the common treatment of age as a discrete variable as well as the caller's certainty about their ages and the ages of their children. There were few rounders in reference to dates; references to certain months or years was apparently considered sufficiently precise in these references to the history of a patient's problem (five references) or the history of medicine (four references). Most references to medical data and relative time intervals were accompanied by rounders which suggested vague two-directional confidence intervals around the stated figure (e.g., "about 40 pounds"). In fact, if we exclude two references to hypothetical values and one request for confirmation, all such references were accompanied by rounders. In the case of the request for confirmation, if the physician had repeated the patient's response verbatim ("*About* ten years.") this would have conveyed a challenge to the accuracy or precision of the report rather than a request for confirmation ("Ten years?"). The references to other variables included one rounder; the physician asserted that "a good bath *or two*" would be sufficient to wash off dead skin which accumulates after a case is removed.

Thus, there were consistent patterns of use of rounders by the type of variable, patterns which probably reflect typical usage in everyday conversation. When speakers reported single, nonhypothetical values of continuous variables, rounders were used to convey a range of values, suggesting that greater precision was both unavailable and unnecessary ("about a month later"). In other types of numerical references, rounders were rarely used and in references to specific ranges, no rounders were used. In addition, most rounders were not accompanied by markers of hesitation or uncertainty. The results are consistent with the conclusion by Prince

et al. (1982) that most rounders do not represent uncertainty but are indications of approximate ranges, where greater precision is unnecessary.

TABLE 1

Patients: Single Numbers

Type of Variable	Rounder	None	Rounder/Total
Medical Data	05	00	05/05 (100%)
Time Intervals	06	00	06/06 (100%)
Dates	01	05	01/06 (17%)
Ages	00	15	00/15 (0%)
Others	01	07	07/07 (0%)

Physicians: Single Numbers

Type of Variable	Rounder	None	Rounder/Total
Medical Data	01	02*	01/03 (33%)
Time Intervals	00	01**	00/01 (0%)
Dates	01	02	01/03 (33%)
Ages	00	08	00/08 (0%)
Others	01	02	01/03 (33%)

* two hypothetical numbers

**one request for confirmation

There were too few numerical references (i.e., per type of variable and speaker) to determine how patients and physicians differ in their use of rounders. There are only a few references to medical data and no references to quantitative results of lab tests. This can be attributed to the lack of importance of lab tests for the diagnosis of the weight and skin problems which were discussed. In similar radio call-in programs which have featured cardiologists, there have been frequent references by patients and physicians to specific quantitative results of lab tests and other diagnostic procedures. And in radio programs which feature nonphysician experts (e.g. physician therapists and nutritionists), there are even more references to quantitative diagnostic and treatment information and fewer hedges. Such differences between physicians and nonphysicians suggests that one way professionals indicate their level of expertise is the degree of uncertainty they convey (e.g., the number of exceptions to generalizations which are implicit or explicit in their hedges).

There were no challenges to unrounded (or rounded) assertions and thus there is no strong evidence that rounders were necessary for providing useful and plausible information. However, there were four references to numbers which illustrate how certain levels of approximation can impede the effective exchange of information.

In the first example, while one would not expect rounders in parents' reports of the number of children they have, one caller reported that "I have ah ah some daughters." This assertion, not included in the count of numerical references, indicates how approximators can be inappropriate when applied to variables which are discrete and which are indisputably known to the speaker. If the caller had not subsequently clarified that he had three daughters, the physician might have challenged and/or doubted the caller's competence both as a reporter of medical information and as a parent.

Second, there was one example of overprecision (or underapproximation) when a caller reported that she had undergone surgery "on December 29th," which was three months earlier. This report did not impede communication but it suggests that repeated overprecision may affect physicians' view of patient competence (as a patient and as a reporter of medical history information). While hedges have been interpreted as having a negative effect on the listener's view of a speaker's competence (Erickson et al., 1978), insufficient approximation may have a similar effect. If patients or physicians do not translate the particulars of their knowledge into a level of precision which matches the listener's interest then such assertions will impede effective communication (Hatch, 1980; O'Barr, 1985; Shuy, 1976). In future studies of the use of rounders in medical discourse, it would be useful to examine how either extreme of approximation or precision affects the plausibility of the assertion, the perceived competence of the speaker, and the effectiveness of the exchange of information. It would also be useful to assess whether either extreme (of approximation or precision) is associated with more challenges or requests for clarification by the listener.

Third, the assertion that "often a good bath *or two*" is sufficient to wash off dead skin illustrated the tendency of the physicians to use multiple qualifiers. If the core assertion is defined as "a bath will wash off the dead skin" then the physician's use of three qualifiers (or two, good, and often) suggests that the statement could be too easily challenged or misinterpreted if fewer qualifiers were used. If the listener found that one bath was not sufficient, the physician has offered several retorts to a potential challenge: the bath may not meet the unstated criteria of "good" bath, two

baths may be needed, two "good" baths may be needed, or more than two "good" baths may be needed.

In the final example, when a physician estimated the calorie intake of a caller's daughter, without knowledge of her dietary or exercise habits, he stated "she's probably takin in *something in excess of* 2500, *maybe 3500* calories." The use of two rounders and a shield ("probably") make the assertion indisputable. If information is defined as that which reduces uncertainty (Waitzkin & Stoeckle, 1972), such an assertion offers little information. No matter what the real calorie intake is, the physician cannot be wrong. The core assertion ("she's taking in more than 2500 calories a day") has been transformed from a defensible approximation to a defensive, uninformative assertion

Hedges: Shields and Adaptors

Callers and physicians were similar in their use of plausibility and attribution shields. When callers described symptoms, many used plausibility shields such as *'it seems like* there's no lump," "*I seem to* have a very unusual skin condition", and "she's *almost* using it (food) like a pacifier." Physicians prefaced some of their assertions with an analagous type of attribution shield, "*by what you're describing* ..." and "you *sound* ah very fair" and "*it sounds like you...* have a problem." Callers reported that one or more family members had "a tendency toward" a certain symptom or behavior and physicians reported that categories of patients such as women and children had a "tendency to have" certain symptoms. Both callers and physicians prefaced some comments with plausibility shields such as "I think that" or " I suppose I would say." The callers used "I guess" or "I suppose" or "as far as I know" whereas the physicians used the more authoritative form "I think." Four different callers prefaced comments with "I don't know but" and one physician prefaced his assertion about the ingredients of shaving cream with "I'm not an expert .. I'm sorry to say but...".

Both callers and physicians used attribution shields. Callers invoked the authority of their own physician when reporting on some symptoms ("the surgeon said") and physicians qualified some assertions by referring to the views of other unnamed physicians ("some people might try you with antibiotics" and "there are ah um all kind of people who believe that ...").

Physicians were unique in using shields which expressed very high degrees of uncertainty or maximum protection against potential challenges. As expected, a few physician assertions included explicit references to the limitations of an

interview without visual contact, as in "It might benefit you ah, again, I, I emphasize 'might' without ah without seeing you." Several shielded assertions appeared to be attempts at polite ways of disagreeing with the caller, such as "you're describing it well but *I'm not sure* the description is necessarily ah ah apt ah" and "you know, *I don't know that* there's a society called Deviant Behavior Anonymous." These could be seen as false hedges, which in attempting to avoid insult had the potential of being interpreted as insulting and even as sarcastic. There were several instances when physicians were adamant about their inability or unwillingness to answer a question, such as:

(1) "Ah, I'm, I'm not quite sure...I'm not going to venture a diagnosis."
(2) "OK again, its its impossible for me to answer, answer your question."
(3) "I really don't want to get into ah ... I don't want to get into that..."

The repetition in these statements suggests that the physicians felt uncomfortable when they did not answer the caller's question. In fact, the repeated hedges quoted above did not follow repeated questions by the callers; callers asked few direct questions and these were usually answered directly by the physicians. These types of hedges could be considered the ultimate shields since no diagnosis or treatment suggestions were ventured.

Numerous physician assertions contained shields which were harder to classify. Many of these assertions included multiple qualifiers and the use of multiple qualifiers is one way physicians differed from callers; physicians used multiple qualifiers much more often than did callers. One way to assess the effect of multiple qualifiers is to rewrite the assertions adding one qualifier at a time, as shown below:

Ex. 1 : Physician (interview 13)
(a) As you change her diet, that will come into focus and the random hyper behavior (will) go
(b) Well, *you may find that*, as you change her diet that will come into focus and the random hyper behavior (will) go
(c) Well, you may find that, as you change her diet *around a little bit*, that will come into focus and the random hyper behavior (will) go
(d) Well, you may find that, as you change her diet around a little bit, *some of* that will come into focus and the random hyper behavior (will) go
(e) Well, you may find that, as you change her diet around a little bit, some of that will come into focus and *some of* the random hyper behavior (will) go
(f) Well, you may find that, as you change her diet around a little bit, some of that will come into focus and some of the random hyper behavior *may* go

Ex. 2: Physician (interview 4)

(a) There (are) other things that have to be examined
(b) There *might be* other things that have to be examined
(c) There might be, *I doubt it by what you're describing but there might be* other things that have to be examined
(d) there might be, I doubt it by what you're describing but, there might be *some* other things that have to be examined

In the examples given above, the first statement in each series may misrepresent the level of certainty of the speaker. However, the second or third statements are defensible forms of the assertion (with one or two hedges). The additional qualifiers do not substantially change the meaning but do transform defensible, qualified assertions into defensive, indisputable ones. Although there is no evidence that callers were dissatisfied with these answers (there were no explicit challenges or requests for clarification), it is hypothesized that the use of multiple, redundant hedges could confuse callers and give them the impression that they did not receive definitive answers or useful information.

There were no striking differences between callers and physicians in their use of adaptors. Four types of adaptors were used, all of which could be interpreted as indicating that the observed phenomena differed somewhat from some prototypical or extreme case. The adaptors were classified as (1) those which minimized the similarity to a prototypical or extreme case, (2) those which gave two-directional hedges much like rounders,(3) those which indicated something was not quite true or untrue, and (4) those which suggested that something was essentially (cut not completely) the same as a prototypical case. Examples of each are given below:

(1) "I mean they're *sort of* lethargic" (caller), "well that's *a little* peculiar" (physician)
(2) "we've always had to *more or less* stay out of the sun" (caller), "she really is *more or less* able" (physician)
(3) "she does*n't* eat *all that* much" (caller), "its *like* not *that* different from" (physician)
(4) "its been *basically* my mother" (caller), "weight is *basically* a calorie gain"(physician)

Intensifiers: Emphasizers

Callers frequently used qualifiers which suggested the severity or prototypicality of symptoms (categorized here as "emphasizers"). Of the few physician uses of emphasizers, several were references to their own experience of relevant symptoms. There were four types of emphasizers: (1) vague adjectives (e.g.

awful, horrendous), (2) vague quantities (e.g. quite a bit, numerous, a lot), (3) adverbs which suggested extreme degrees (e.g. very, terribly, extremely), and (4) other adverbs which added emphasis (e.g. just, even, still, only), as shown in the examples below:

(1) "It looks *awful*" (caller), "it looks *horrendous* " (physician)
(2) "we had to go through *a lot of* therapy on that" (caller), they eat *a lot of* sweets" (physician)
(3) "my background is *extremely* sensitive skin" (caller), "they're *very* effective" (physician)
(4) "*even* with that block ... I can *still* get burnt" (caller), "I wouldn't *even* worry" (physician)

It appears as if such qualifiers are used to help prove the caller's case that their symptoms are serious and thus important enough to warrant diagnostic investigation and/or therapeutic intervention. Not surprisingly, the physicians sounded most like the callers when they described their own symptoms but such references to themselves were rare. It would be interesting to assess whether physicians' assertions were similar to those of patients in situations where they were patients speaking to their own physicians.

Intensifiers: Absolutes and Markers of Certainty

The simplest markers of certainty were the markers within the propositional content which conveyed absolutes in terms of time (e.g., "always" or "never") and amounts (e.g. "not a bit" or "not at all"). Callers and physicians used such qualifiers rarely and usually in references to particular symptoms.

The more interesting markers of certainty were used to convey the speaker's committment to a proposition (or "markers of certainty"). These included qualifiers which conveyed (1) lack of doubt (e.g. "obviously" and "definitely"), (2) certain truth (e.g., "the fact that" and "the truth of the matter is"), (3) explicit references to the speaker (e.g., "in fact we are positive" and "I'm sure that" and "we know that"), (4) authoritative directives (e.g., "you're going to have to cook more fish") and (5) others including metaphors (e.g., "it's a sign as big as any billboard").

Physicians used intensifiers about twice as often as callers (19% of physicians' assertions versus 11% of callers' assertions) and used a greater variety of intensifiers. All of the intensifiers used by callers referred to symptoms and only one included an explicit reference to the speaker (and his wife); he commented "she, *in fact we are positive*, is involved in some promiscuous activity".

Where physicians used qualifiers to suggest certainty, the core assertions often represented truisms or refutations of absurd hypothetical situations. In a discussion of the kinds and amounts of food which can cause obesity, a caller argued that his daughter could be getting fat by eating too much food, even if she was eating nutritious, low-calorie foods. The physician expressed certainty in his dispute of an extreme extension of the patient's assertion: "You can get fat eating a thousand bananas in the day, *the truth of the matter is*, you'll get full long before you get fat." The physician's statement is unrefutable though it does not refute the patient's assertion. Later, in the same interview, the physician attempted to convey the level of responsibility parents have for the kinds of foods their children eat. The child in question was an overweight five-year-old. The physician commented, "Y'know the the fact that if it isn't in the house -- she doesn't shop. When was the last time she took the car and went to the ACME? It doesn't happen -- if the food's not in the house, she's not going to eat it." One caller noted that when his daughter ate chocolate or other sweets, she became hyperactive and had a tendency to get migraine headaches. The physician responded: "And so what she's showing you -- and it's a sign as big as any billboard you're going to pass on the highway -- is she's a kid who shouldn't eat chocolate."

In some cases, the use of qualifiers which expressed certainty were used in restatements of callers' reports, perhaps to convey empathy or agreement:

> Caller: (my daughter and I) had to come live with my mother, my daughter jumped two sizes... it was a lot of traumatic things going on ...(and I was) in the hospital and my husband and I separated..."
>
> Physician: *Certainly* you- your illness and the disruption in the family -- ah moving ah into the ah other environment of her grandmother's house -- these things *have to have* an effect on on *any* ah child.

The only new information is that such traumas would effect *any* child but the assertion ("have to have an effect") is much too general to be classified as useful information. In another interview, the same physician asserted that "a lot of children suffer from terrible problems and *that's a fact of life*." And there were numerous instances where the physician prefaced a restatement of the patient's report with "obviously," as in "*obviously* there is concern (by you)" and "*obviously* sunburn can make you sick."

The most emphatic markers of certainty communicated that (a) the statement was true in all cases and (b) therefore, certain information was considered irrelevant:

Physician: "If she eats fewer calories -- *and I don't care what level she's at now* -- she's going to not be as heavy as she is.

Physician: "If you look at any diet -- *and I don't care whether its the grapefruit diet or the Scarsdale diet or the Weight Watchers diet or even the diet that U.S. Health Care does ah within our HMO, where we have a a an eating program called Health Eating* -- it's still a calorie-restricted diet."

There were numerous directives with markers of certainty, as in "you*'ve got to be* very careful" and "its a conversation you*'re going to have to have.*" However, most directives were less direct and less certain.

Out of a total of 38 physician assertions with markers of certainty, only five offered specific medical information which did not constitute restatements of patient reports or a nonphysician's level of knowledge about sunburn, diets, weight gain or other health issues:

(1) "As far as skin cancers are concerned, its (melanoma is) *clearly the most* dangerous"
(2) "Our skin is is active, its alive, its *always* turning over"
(3) "Ah *its become clear* that another effect of sunlight is to deplete ... Langheran cells"
(4) "One of the side effects of sun..*its becoming more evident*.. is telangiecetasias"
(5) "*We know that* there are hormones and things that..actually suppress appetite"

In fact, two of the statements shown above could also be considered common knowledge: that melanomas are the most dangerous form of skin cancer and that skin is continually shed and replaced.

Finally, one of the most absurd uses of intensifiers occurred in the following assertion by the dermatologist: "it (the rash) will have *no effect whatsoever* on your broken bones." There was no evidence that the caller was requesting information about the effects of superficial skin rashes on the healing of broken bones. This is an extreme example of the difficulty physicians face in estimating the level of knowledge of their patients, since a comment which would be reassuring to one patient could be insulting to another. (Though the behavior of these two physicians cannot be assumed to be representative of physicians in general, the pediatrician did seem to underestimate the comprehension level of his adult callers more often than did the dermatologist.) For this study, it is further evidence of the physician's tendency to use intensifiers where the core assertion was already indisputable.

Conclusion

The analysis of 14 caller-patient conversations indicated that: (1) physicians used qualifiers more often than callers, (2) physicians used hedges more often than callers, (3) callers and physicians used hedges more often than intensifiers, (4) there were more qualifiers which conveyed different levels of uncertainty, (5) physicians used markers of certainty more often than callers, and (6) physicians used multiple qualifiers more often than callers. It was predicted that physicians would use hedges often and more often than callers. However, the physicians' frequent use of *multiple* hedges was surprising and resulted in assertions which were both irrefutable and uninformative. While physicians used intensifiers more often than expected, an examination of the "intensified" assertions indicated that physicians limited mot of their expressions of certainty to core assertions which were truisms or extreme hypothetical cases (or 'straw men,' which were also irrefutable and uninformative). The study offers some support for the hypothesis that physicians qualify their medical advice in ways which make their assertions less disputable and in ways which could impede effective communication. Further studies are needed to assess whether physician (or patient) uses of qualifiers impede the ability of patients and physicians to fulfill their objectives for such encounters.

---

[1]This paper was written for the course "Language and the Professions" taught by Dr. Teresa Pica, University of Pennsylvania, Spring, 1988.

References

Boguch, Bryna and Brenda Danet (1984). Challenge and control in lawyer-client interaction: A case study in an Israeli legal aid office. TEXT 4.

Bonanno, Michelina (1982). Women's language in the medical interview. In Robert J. DiPietro (Ed.). Linguistics and the Professions. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Cicourel, Aaron V. (1981). Language and medicine. In Charles A Ferguson and Shirley Brice Heath (Eds.) Language in the U.S.A.. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Erickson, Bonnie E., A. Lind, B. Johnson and W. O'Barr (1978). Speech style and impression formation in a court setting: The effects of "powerful" and "powerless" speech. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 14, 266-279.

Frankel, Richard M. (1984). From sentence to sentence: Understanding the medical encounter through microinteractional analysis. Discourse Processes 7, 135-170.

Hatch, Evelyn and M. Long (1980). Discourse analysis, what's that? In Diane Larsen-Freeman (Ed.). Discourse Analysis in Second Language Acquisition. Rowley, MA.: Newbury House.

Katriel, Tamar and P. Nesher (1987). Songs and homework: The rhetoric of instruction on Israeli radio (unpublished manuscript).

Labov, William and D. Fanshel (1977). Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation. New York: Academic Press.

Mischler, Elliott G. (1984). The Discourse of Medicine: Dialectics of Medical Interviews. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

O'Barr, William M and J. Conley (1985). Litigant satisfaction versus legal adequacy in small claims court narratives. Law and Society Review 19, 4.

Prince, Ellen, J. Frader and C. Bosk (1982). On hedging in physician-physician discourse. In Robert J. DiPietro (Ed.). Linguistics and the Professions. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Shuy, Roger W. (1976). The medical interview: Problems in communication. Primary Care 3, 3, 365-368.

Tannen, Deborah and C. Wallat (1982). A sociolinguistic analysis of multiple demands on the pediatrician in doctor/mother/child interaction. In Robert J. DiPietro (Ed.) Linguistics and the Professions. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Todd, Alexandra D. (1984). The prescription of contraception: Negotiations between doctors and patients. Discourse Processes 7, 171-200.

Waitzkin H and J.D. Stoeckle (1972). The communication of information about illness: Clinical, sociological and methodological considerations. Advances in Psychosomatic Medicine 8, 180-215.

West, Candace (1984). Medical misfires: Mishearings, misgivings and misunderstandings in physician-patients dialogues. Discourse Processes 7, 107-134.